

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Indiana that the agreement reached at the afternoon session was that at the evening session no business should be transacted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No business of any kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Except the matter of discussing the pending bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I took it for granted that nobody was ready to proceed; and I am quite sure, as far as our side is concerned, there will be no objection.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not know that there is any objection to that bill, but there is a growing feeling in the Senate that unanimous-consent agreements are being abused. I do not think there ought to be any violation of any of these agreements under any circumstances.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As a matter of course, if there is any objection I will withdraw the request.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not know that there is any objection to the bill at all, but I think Senators ought to observe unanimous-consent agreements when they are made, and nothing should be done contrary to such agreements when made.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have no desire to violate any unanimous-consent agreement, and I have withdrawn my request.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that nothing should be done at the session this evening, as I understand it, except the delivery of a speech by the Senator from Tennessee and a speech by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER].

Mr. BEVERIDGE. So the Chair informed me, and when the Chair did so inform me there was not on my part any further request to proceed with the bill to which I referred.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was not criticising the action of the Senator at all.

#### CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

[Mr. CARMACK addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. RAWLINS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 2, 1902, at 11 o'clock a. m.

### SENATE.

MONDAY, June 2, 1902.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut) announced his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1346) granting a pension to Adelbert L. Orr, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of Edward S. Brown Post, No. 44, Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic; of the McKinley Club of Elizabeth, and of the board of fire commissioners of Hoboken, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of letter carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avon, N. J., praying for the appointment of a commission to test the practical workings of woman's suffrage in various Western States; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Slate Lick, Pa., and of Carona, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented petitions of the board of directors of the Second National Bank of Atlantic City and of the board of directors of the Atlantic Safe Deposit and Trust Company, of Atlantic City, in the State of New Jersey, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a public building at that place; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented a memorial of sundry citi-

zens of Orange, N. J., remonstrating against the granting of reciprocity concessions and the ratification of reciprocity treaties inimical to American interests; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Turn Verein, of Atlantic City, N. J., expressing sympathy for the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented the petitions of William M. Casselberry, of Haddonfield, and of Mrs. J. L. Allen, of Pennington, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction and maintenance of suitable buildings at the United States military posts and for the betterment of the daily rations of the soldiers; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented a petition of the congregation of the Reformed Church of Paramus, of Ridgewood, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation appropriating \$1,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of post exchanges; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented petitions of Local Division No. 10, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of Jersey City; of Wilson Lodge, No. 273, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Junction, and of Newark Lodge, No. 219, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Newark, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented a memorial of Camden Division, No. 22, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Camden, N. J., remonstrating against the operations of the so-called beef trust and praying for the repeal of the tariff on meats; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented petitions of the Liquor Dealers' Protective Association of Orange; of the Retail Liquor Dealers' Association of Rahway; of the West Hoboken Liquor Dealers' Association, of West Hoboken; of the German-American Liquor Dealers' Association, of Elizabeth, and of the German Liquor Dealers' Association, of Trenton, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also (for Mr. DRYDEN) presented petitions of the Essex Trades' Council, of Newark; of Iron Molders' Local Union No. 99, of Bridgeton; of the commissioners of public education of Hoboken, and of the trustees of the Free Public Library, of Hoboken, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the compensation of letter carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Maritime Exchange of Provincetown, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children, and also to fix the compensation of the district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MASON presented a memorial of the Aurora Turnverein Society, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the United Mine Workers' Local Union, of Ledford; of Local Union No. 10, of Mapleton; of Local Union No. 633, of Athens; of Federal Labor Union No. 9718, of New Burnside; of Local Union No. 86, of Tilton; of Local Union No. 563, of East Peoria; of the Local Union of Bloomington; of Local Union No. 848, of Donkville; of Local Union No. 1457, of Etherley; of Local Union No. 1064, of Morris; of Local Union No. 1782, of Braidwood; of Local Union No. 1880, of Marion; of Local Union No. 1941, of Johnson City; of the Local Union of Iglesby; of Local Union No. 2, of Spring Valley; of Local Union No. 34, of Wanlock; of Local Union No. 67, of Breese; of Local Union No. 221, of Cable; of Local Union No. 300, of Nilwood; of Local Union No. 309, of Hunrod; of Local Union No. 344, of Greenville; of Local Union No. 348, of Nillery; of Local Union No. 362, of Coal Valley; of Local Union No. 388, of Peoria; of Local Union No. 492, of Springfield; of Local Union No. 522, of Pekin; of Local Union No. 575, of Pinckneyville; of Local Union No. 646, of Taylorville; of Local Union No. 654, of Tallula; of Local Union No. 668, of Worden; of Local Union No. 683, of Murphysboro; of Local Union No. 694, of Girard; of Local Union No. 696, of Middle Grove; of Local Union No. 702, of Carlinville; of Local Union No. 707, of Bartonville; of Local Union No. 710, of Carterville; of Local Union No. 715, of Odin; of Local Union No.

734, of Peoria; of Local Union No. 736, of Spring Valley; of Local Union No. 743, of Lebanon; of Local Union No. 750, of Lynns Station; of Local Union No. 757, of Elkville; of Local Union No. 800, of Streator; of Local Union No. 848, of Donkville; of Local Union No. 859, of Belleville; of Local Union No. 860, of St. Davids; of Local Union No. 883, of Canton; of Local Union No. 892, of Kingston; of Local Union No. 895, of Roanoke; of Local Union No. 951, of Sato; of Local Union No. 982, of Fredonia; of Local Union No. 719, of Edinburg; of Local Union No. 992, of Kangley; of Local Union No. 1104, of Sherrard; of Local Union No. 1207, of Tamaroa, and of Local Union No. 1391, of Thayer, all of the American Federation of Labor, in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented petitions of J. K. Howard, of Livonia; of E. V. Fitzpatrick, of Portland, and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Elkhart, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of the Wabash Baking Powder Company, of Wabash; of Hulman & Co., of Terre Haute, and of Joseph Strong & Co., of Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the passage of the so-called pure-food bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Westfield Monthly Meeting of Friends, of Westfield, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the National Capitol; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

He also presented a petition of Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Elkhart, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Citizens' Northwest Suburban Association of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the removal of overhead telephone wires in the city of Washington, and for such extension of underground conduits within the fire limits and overhead wires beyond such limits as will give telephone service to many citizens of the District who are not now able to secure it; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 33, of Indianapolis; of Local Union No. 190, of Buckeye; of Local Union No. 1491, of Sophia; of Local Union No. 1634, of Petersburg; of Local Union No. 1698, of Bicknell; of Local Union No. 1713, of Dugger; of Local Union No. 1744, of Williamsport; of Local Union No. 1755, of Mecca; of Local Union No. 1895, of Embury; of Local Union No. 1952, of Raglesville; of Local Union No. 21, of Princeton; of Local Union No. 24, of Rosedale; of Local Union No. 134, of Alum Cave; of Local Union No. 139, of Lyford; of Local Union No. 198, of Seelyville; of Local Union No. 255, of Dugger; of Local Union No. 277, of Turner; of Local Union No. 390, of Evansville; of Local Union No. 412, of Hymera; of Local Union No. 418, of Seelyville; of Local Union No. 25, of Linton; of Local Union No. 713, of Sophia; of Local Union No. 724, of Heckland; of Local Union No. 756, of Hymera; of Local Union No. 780, of Linton; of Local Union No. 966, of Edwardsport; of Local Union No. 1095, of Dugger; of Local Union No. 1065, of Evansville; of Local Union No. 1075, of Staunton; of Local Union No. 1111, of Eagle; of Local Union No. 1131, of Staunton; of Local Union No. 1156, of Brazil; of Local Union No. 1177, of Vincennes; of Local Union No. 1243, of Boonville; of Local Union No. 1335, of Clinton; of Local Union No. 1383, of Linton; of Local Union No. 1410, of Winslow; of Local Union No. 1411, of Burnett; of local unions of Cannellburg, Midland, Montgomery, and Lyons; of Local Union No. 1460, of Midland, all of the United Mine Workers of America, and State of Indiana, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Council of Peru, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for an increase in the compensation of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of Main Lodge, No. 545, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of East St. Louis, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called Grosvenor anti-injunction bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HAWLEY presented a petition of Local Division No. 29, Order of Railroad Telegraphers, of New Haven, Conn., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the National Hardwood Lumber Association, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation for the establishment of a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian Mountains; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5931) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Daniels, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5944) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Willey, alias William F. Willey;

A bill (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to William F. Bowden;

A bill (H. R. 10794) granting a pension to Thomas H. Devitt;

A bill (H. R. 13063) granting an increase of pension to Julia B. Shurtleff; and

A bill (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Ella B. S. Mannix.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6016) for the suppression of train robbery in the Territories of the United States and elsewhere, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

#### JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

Mr. SIMON. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11599) to redivide the district of Alaska into three recording and judicial divisions, to report it favorably without amendment, and I am also instructed by the committee to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon, under instructions from the Committee on the Judiciary, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to inquire of the Senator who has reported the bill—

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. LODGE. I think the understanding was absolute, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that there should be no business done until the completion of the Philippines government bill except conference reports and ordinary routine business.

Mr. CULLOM. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think we ought to take up any other bill under the unanimous-consent agreement. I have no objection in the world to the bill, but I think it is a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. If Senators on the other side disagree with me, of course I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported the bill favorably and asked unanimous consent for its consideration, which was given. Of course it is open to objection at any time. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MALLORY. I did not rise to object. I simply wish to inquire what is this district. There is nothing indicated in the bill, that I can gather from hearing it read, to show whether it is a judicial district or what kind of a district it is. I suppose that it is a judicial district.

Mr. SIMON. I will state to the Senator from Florida that the bill undertakes to redivide the judicial district of the Territory.

Mr. MALLORY. I think it had better so state.

Mr. SIMON. It undertakes to divide the business into several districts. It is a matter of some importance that the bill should be passed early.

Mr. HOAR. It comes from the Department.

Mr. SIMON. Yes; the bill was prepared in the Department of Justice.

Mr. LODGE. There is no objection to the bill, I understand.

Mr. SIMON. I was instructed by the committee to ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MALLORY. I only call attention to the fact that there is nothing in the bill to indicate, as far as I have been able to hear, that it is a judicial district which is referred to.



Mr. SIMON. Yes; it is a judicial district.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not know anything about this bill, whether it is in proper form or whether it ought to be passed, but I do know that there has been an understanding in the Senate by which unanimous consent was given that there should be nothing considered but the Philippines government bill, except conference reports. I believe such unanimous-consent agreements facilitate the public business very much, but when there is a practical violation of the unanimous-consent agreement, as the passage of this bill or the passage of anything else would be, it seems to me that it goes very far toward putting things in such a condition here that unanimous-consent agreements will not be hereafter given. I think when unanimous consent is given in the Senate to carry out a particular line it ought to be strictly adhered to and there ought not to be any deviation from it.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. SIMON. If that is the view of Senators, I ask leave to withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the immediate consideration of the bill is withdrawn, and it goes to the Calendar.

AMANDA C. MITCHELL.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. COCKRELL on the 29th ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Amanda C. Mitchell, mother of Phelps Mitchell, late a messenger of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 6034) raising the rank of Chief Engineer David Smith on the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6035) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Oliver; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 6036) regulating the duties and fixing the compensation of the customs inspectors at the port of Chicago; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6037) for the relief of W. L. Clifford, a letter carrier in the service of the Post-Office Department of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6038) for the establishment of a juvenile court in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6039) to create the district of Sabine, in the State of Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 6040) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 6041) granting an increase of pension to Joel H. Warren; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with the bill, I present the petition of Dr. Joel H. Warren, together with the affidavits of Dr. L. C. Miller and Dr. N. J. Rains, and also letters from the War Department and Pension Office. I move that the bill and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Pensions. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 109) authorizing the President of the United States to cause medals to be struck and presented to officers and soldiers and others who served in the Spanish war, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MALLORY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the construction of a fireproof building for Bureau of Equipment at Pensacola Navy-Yard, Fla., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

#### THE ISTHMIAN CANAL.

On motion of Mr. KITTREDGE, it was

*Ordered*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 783, part 2, first session Fifty-seventh Congress, being additional views of the minority of the Committee on Inter-oceanic

Canals on the bill of the House of Representatives to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

FRANCES L. ACKLEY.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Frances L. Ackley, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

J. H. GALLINGER,  
GEORGE TURNER,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*  
J. N. W. RUMPLE,  
ELIAS DEEMER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

KATHARINE RAINS PAUL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Rains Paul, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

#### CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2295.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. DEPEW. Mr. President, I will be unable to be here tomorrow and to vote upon this bill, but I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. MCENERY). I am compelled to leave next week for the balance of the session and that arrangement was made based upon the optimism of the steering committee early in the session that they would close the present session of Congress on the 10th of June. That hopeful view seems now hardly possible of realization. Therefore I have secured a pair for the balance of the session.

I wish also to give notice that I will offer a few remarks on Saturday morning, after the routine morning hour, on Senate bill 492, for the purchase of a national forest reserve in the Southern Appalachian Mountains.

Mr. LODGE. On behalf of the majority of the committee, I desire to offer certain amendments to perfect the bill, of which I gave notice when I was last up.

On page 2, line 15, before the word "herein," I move to insert the word "and;" so as to read "thereby and herein."

That was a mistake in printing the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Where is that?

Mr. LODGE. It was an amendment that I put in the other day, suggested, I think, by the Senator from Iowa. He suggested putting in "and herein," and in printing it the word "and" was left out.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not see the words in line 15.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts from what print of the bill he is reading?

Mr. LODGE. I am reading from the last print of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. May 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the print with all the amendments as adopted, the Chair understands.

Mr. LODGE. These amendments, I will say, are made on the last print, ordered by the Senate on the 29th of May, and when they are adopted I will ask another print to be made to-day, so that Senators may have it on their desks to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts?

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 7, line 8, at the end of section 6, I move, after the word "government," to change the period to a colon and to insert:

*Provided*, That the President may, in his discretion, employ the service of the Census Bureau in compiling and promulgating the statistical information above provided for, and may commit to such Bureau any part or portion of such labor as to him may seem wise.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 9, line 13, after the word "provided," I move to insert "shall classify and;" so that, if amended, the paragraph will read:

That the government of the Philippines, subject to the provisions of this act and except as hereinafter provided, shall classify and shall make rules

and regulations for the lease, sale, or other disposition of the public lands other than timber or mineral lands, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 19, page 9, I move to strike out the words "next ensuing session" and to insert in lieu the words "first or second session thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. At the end of line 21 on page 9 I move to strike out the word "session" and to insert the word "period;" so as to read:

They shall at the close of such period have the force and effect, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 10, line 18, I move to strike out "8" and insert "12;" so as to read, "Section 12." It is a wrong reference.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. At the top of page 11 I move to strike out the words:

Nor more than 5,000 acres to any corporation or association of persons.

And to insert:

But no such land shall be leased, let, or demised to any corporation until a law regulating the disposition of the public lands shall have been enacted under the provisions of section 12.

Mr. HOAR. By whom is that law to be enacted?

Mr. LODGE. By the Philippine Commission, to be drafted and submitted to the President for his approval, and to Congress. It can not become a law without the approval of Congress.

Mr. HOAR. Is there any objection to putting in the amendment "and approved as herein provided?"

Mr. LODGE. "Enacted and approved." That is all it means, and I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALLISON. "As provided in section 12," I would say.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; "as provided in section 12."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 11, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words:

Nor more than five thousand acres to any corporation or association of persons.

And insert:

But no such land shall be leased, let, or demised to any corporation until a law regulating the disposition of the public lands shall have been enacted and approved as provided in section 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 4—

Mr. CULBERSON. I was called out of the Chamber when the amendment on page 9, line 13, was adopted. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that it seems to me it would be better to provide the classification which shall be made. The bill as amended reads, "and except as herein provided, shall classify and shall make rules and regulations for the lease, sale, or other disposition of the public lands."

Now, what do we mean by classify? To classify into what character of lands? Are the lands to be classified as agricultural or as nonagricultural, or into what classification is the lands to be divided? The bill as amended provides for the lease, sale, or other disposition of public lands other than timber or mineral lands.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. And then that those lands shall be classified. How? What character of classification shall be made?

Mr. LODGE. As the section now reads it applies, of course, and is intended to apply, only to the agricultural lands, as a separate provision is made for timber and mineral lands. The idea of the committee, suggested, I believe, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. DIETRICH], who has visited the islands and is familiar also with the classification of land in the West, is that there is great variety in these agricultural lands. Some are very valuable, others less valuable, and others are of comparatively little value. The Senator from Nebraska thought they ought to be classified, because the classification might have an important effect on the law which was to be drafted regulating the grants, and that it was important that Congress should know about the classification of the different grades of agricultural lands.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is what I desire that the bill shall state. Otherwise there is no direction here as to what classification shall be made. The Philippine Commission is directed to classify the lands. To classify them with reference to what?

Mr. LODGE. We can not undertake here to direct the Commission on the spot as to how they shall classify lands about which we know nothing. What we want to get is a classification made by intelligent and informed persons on the spot. The word I think is clear and is understood in the matter of classifying agricultural lands.

Mr. DIETRICH. Mr. President, I should like to further state, in answer to the Senator from Texas, that in our hearings held to prepare the irrigation bill the matter of classification of lands came

up for discussion. That bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior in this country shall classify the lands, and in his judgment shall allot 40 acres under some circumstances as the amount to be given to one person, and 160 acres in another case to another person, all depending upon the productiveness of the land. In the southwestern part of the United States where they grow fruit 40 acres—

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DIETRICH. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. The statement of the Senator suggests to me that if the bill would read "that the Philippine Commission shall classify the land according to productiveness"—

Mr. DIETRICH. And the kinds of products that grow in various localities.

Mr. CULBERSON. It would make it plainer. Otherwise the Commission are simply required to classify the land without reference to the character of the land or the productiveness of it, or whether it is watered land or dry land, as we call it in the Southwest. I simply make the suggestion.

Mr. LODGE. I think before I complete these amendments and the bill goes to the printer the Senator can perhaps draft two or three words which we can add to the amendment. I have no objection to making that specification.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. On page 11, line 4, at the end of the line, I move to strike out "thirteen" and insert "fourteen." That is to correct a section reading.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 12, line 10, after the word "land," I move to insert "sufficient for a mill site, not to exceed 10 acres."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. In line 11, page 12, I move to strike out the words "sufficient for a mill site."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 13, line 7, I move to strike out the words "fourteen, to" and to insert "nineteen, shall." That is simply to correct a section reference.

Mr. FORAKER. That amendment refers to the provision in regard to mining claims, I believe?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no doubt the amendment is a proper one to make. I shall support it. But before it is passed upon I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to make some remarks which I have been struggling for several days to find opportunity to make, but unavailingly.

In the course of some remarks I made in this Chamber on the 14th day of May I had occasion to make use of some editorials from various Democratic newspapers over the country. Among others I made use of some editorials taken from the Denver News, for which editorials the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] has told us he is responsible.

I made use of those editorials, Mr. President, as I announced at the time, only for the purpose of defending the action of the Administration of President McKinley in acquiring and retaining the Philippine Islands and in pursuing the policy which has been pursued there ever since we came into possession of them. I had no thought in making use of those editorials of misquoting anybody, or of putting anyone in any false light, or of misrepresenting in any sense the position of anyone.

I did not undertake, and I did not pretend, when I was making use of those editorials, to quote all the editorials in any one of the many papers I quoted from, neither did I undertake to quote all of any editorial from which I made quotation. I did not feel that it was necessary that I should do so, any more than I would deem it necessary, if I should see fit to make a quotation from the speech made by the Senator from Colorado, to which I am going to say something in reply, to quote his whole speech. I quoted enough, as I thought, to properly and fairly show the views entertained at that time by those from whom I quoted, and I so announced.

My quotations were necessarily brief, because I did not want to encumber the RECORD nor encumber my speech with unduly extended quotations from even so able an editorial writer as is the editorial writer for the Denver News.

Notwithstanding I made that announcement, when the junior Senator from Colorado came to make his speech a few days later he took occasion to say that I had omitted to quote an editorial published in his paper on the 2d day of December, 1898; that I had omitted to quote from certain other editorials which had appeared in his paper, and that I had not quoted all of the editorials from which I had taken extracts, and he stated in that connection that I was guilty of a lack of candor and a lack of frankness in making these omissions, and insisted upon that, although I at the time called his attention to the language he employed.



I quote as follows from the speech of the Senator from Colorado:

It is a matter of little moment who wrote the editorials in question. It is sufficient for me to say that I control the paper. I was then and I am now responsible for all its editorial utterances.

But, Mr. President, I have something to say about these editorials in addition to what the Senator from Ohio has said. Until about the 1st day of December, 1898—some two months before the ratification of the Spanish treaty—I favored holding the Philippines and I advocated the government of the Philippines by the United States.

I would not take any time upon this subject were it not that I feel I am but a type of hundreds of thousands of the American people in their changing views upon our duty in the Philippines, commencing with the destruction of the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, proceeding with the treaty of peace, the annexation of the islands, and the government of those islands, accompanied by their subjugation. It would be a waste of time upon my part to continue reference to these matters if I could not in a proper way show how those views came to be held, what brought about a change in views, if a change occurred, and what it was that led to the stand and induced the changes of mind.

I said that up to the 1st day of December the News consistently advocated the holding of the Philippine Islands, but from that time, commencing with the 2d day of December, two months before the ratification of the treaty, the News and myself, to the best of our ability, advocated a change of policy and stood for the independence of the Philippine Islands and in opposition to all of the conduct that has marked the possession of them by the United States since.

I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that at the time the change I referred to occurred there was no election pending. The election of 1898 had but just occurred, and none was to be held for nearly two years.

There was no Democratic President in office; there was no patronage to seek; there were no friends to reward; it was almost two years from a Presidential election. I can say with truth that the change was made out of no other cause than that of an honest conviction that the policy the Administration had adopted was a bad one both for our country and the archipelago.

Later, in the course of the Senator's speech, the following colloquy occurred:

MR. FORAKER. The Senator will excuse me for interrupting him. I was unavoidably occupied for the moment, and I did not get the date of the change given by the Senator.

MR. PATTERSON. The latter part of November, or early in December.

MR. FORAKER. Eighteen hundred and ninety-eight?

MR. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; in 1898.

MR. FORAKER. I understood the Senator to state that he himself and his paper, the Denver News, advocated the acquisition and retention of the Philippine Islands down to November or the beginning of December, 1898.

MR. PATTERSON. Yes.

MR. FORAKER. And that at that time both changed?

MR. PATTERSON. Yes.

MR. FORAKER. But that neither the Senator, as the owner and the responsible party connected with the paper, nor the paper itself, has advocated that policy since?

MR. PATTERSON. Never since; and I say that in the face of the editorials printed in the Denver News in the month of February and read by the Senator; and I will show to the Senate that in reading these editorials the Senator from Ohio was not candid, for he omitted editorials and omitted parts of editorials that would have shown the matter differently from what he sought to convey.

Further along he emphasized this statement, as follows:

As to the putting of other editorials in the RECORD, I will say that until the latter part of November, 1898, the Senator will find many editorials in the News that he did not read along the same line as those that he did read; but after the latter part of November he will find none that point in that direction. Those that he read and many that he omitted, printed after November, 1898, show beyond peradventure the attitude of the paper to be as I state. I find in going over the pages of the Denver News that the identical articles I have in mind bore somebody's check mark, as if whoever had gone over the files for the purposes of the Senator from Ohio had checked them off and knew what they were.

Now, Mr. President, let me not be misunderstood. Until the latter part of November, 1898, it was as I have stated; but on the 2d day of December the first editorial opposing expansion was printed, and that editorial had a check mark upon it which indicated that it had been seen; but that editorial was not quoted. The honorable Senator skipped the editorial of December 2 and went to the editorial of December 7. Let me read the editorial in the Denver News of December 2, so that Senators may pass judgment upon it. It is entitled "Management of the Philippines."

He stated further that if I had quoted all of these editorials and all of each of the editorials I quoted from it would have been made to appear plainly, as he then asserted without qualification, that from and after the 2d day of December, 1898, neither he nor his paper, although they favored the ratification of the treaty, and in that way the acquisition of the Philippine Islands, ever favored for the Filipinos anything except only the independence of the Filipinos occupying those islands. In other words, he said they changed their policy on the 2d day of December, 1898, and so announced, and that I ought to have made that appear.

His attention was called to some editorials quoted by me on the 6th and 7th days of February, immediately after the fighting at Manila had commenced. He admitted that they were of the same general character as those appearing before the 2d day of December, 1898, but said at the time when they were published he was under the erroneous impression that the Filipinos were the aggressors instead of the Americans being the aggressors, as he says he has since learned, and that immediately thereafter, as soon as he learned of the facts, he again changed back to the position he had taken on the 2d day of December, 1898, and never, with the exception of these two or three editorials in February, having relation to that conflict at Manila, has there appeared in his paper anything except only a consistent demand for the independence of the Filipinos.

Mr. President, under such a challenge as that, for that is what it amounts to, if that is not too harsh a term, I have taken occa-

sion to examine the files of the Denver News, in order, in the first place, that I might do justice to the Senator from Colorado, if I have done him any injustice, by correcting what I have said and by supplying anything I have omitted that I should not have omitted.

Instead of the Senator from Colorado being sustained by the result of that examination, I find that whatever may have been my lack of candor or frankness, the record will make a pretty strong charge in that respect against the junior Senator from Colorado, if he knew at the time when he made the statement he did of what had appeared in his own newspaper and most of which had probably been written by him, for, Mr. President, omitting very much that I would under other circumstances elaborate and dwell upon if I had the time, I find instead of taking a departure, and so announcing on the 2d day of December, 1898, the Senator took no such departure at that time, but simply on that day commenced to wobble. Up to that time he had been a firm, unqualified, enthusiastic, and zealous advocate of the acquisition and retention of the Philippine Islands and the subordination of everybody there to the authority of our Government, but on that date the Senator in the long editorial, which he himself has put into the RECORD, and to which I point for proof of what I say, after discussing the various troublesome questions arising in consequence of our acquisition, stated in conclusion the various claims of various people as to what should be our policy, but does not align himself with either one of the parties from whom he quotes, or either of the classes from whom he quotes as to what this policy was thereafter to be, and does not announce or even intimate a change of attitude. All that indicates that he was probably "wavering" is his parade of the troubles we were to be called on to meet.

The last paragraph of this editorial shows all I state. I quote it, as follows:

These are but a few of the perplexing questions connected with the possession of our new accessions. What to do with them or how to manage them is, therefore, a problem worthy of the best thought of the best Americans. There are those who suggest that what should be done is, having ratified the treaty, we proceed as rapidly as possible to give freedom to the Philippines. Establish an American protectorate, make person and property secure, require political and religious freedom, and their people, in the setting up of a republic, see that the republic is maintained, obtain reasonable commercial and other advantages to the United States that shall be perpetual, retain ample facilities for coaling stations and cable terminals there and in the Ladrone and Carolines. Startle the civilized world with the most sublimely grand and magnanimous national deed that history has ever recorded. Wrest a nation from its oppressors and say to it, "Now you are free."

That the Senator was, at most, only wavering is shown by the following editorial, which appeared in the Denver Daily News, December 21, 1898:

#### TELLER AND THE PHILIPPINES.

It is a proof of the newness of the problems involved in the Philippine question that neither the President nor any of his responsible advisers nor Mr. Bryan nor Mr. TELLER nor any other man in high position has attempted to outline a positive plan for the disposition of the islands. As yet we are so far from discussing details that the chief principles have scarcely been defined.

It is manifest from this editorial that the Senator was in doubt, and that others upon whom he had been accustomed to rely as to political policies were also in trouble as to what should be our policy in the Philippines. It may be that the doubt or trouble that finds this expression in his paper on the 21st of December was caused by an interview with Mr. Bryan published a few days before, and with respect to which, on the 15th of December, 1898, the Denver News editorially said:

Mr. Bryan is opposed to expansion in the sense of acquiring territory at a great distance, in a tropical latitude, and peopled by tropical races. His opinion is worthy of respect. We know that he is not the man to reach any conclusion which is not based upon earnest thought and a desire to be right.

In arranging the final disposition of the Philippines it may be that a plan can be found which will secure for the United States the benefits while avoiding the perplexities of complete sovereignty.

This doubt and uncertainty continued without any change, so far as the examination I have made discloses, until the February editorials quoted in my former speech. They were, it will be remembered, very warlike. But they did not long continue. He again began to waver. I say "waver," because I do not observe any positive change of attitude. The Senator has told us that he not only changed, but why. Whatever the cause may be, it is at least a coincidence worthy of note that on the 12th day of February, Mr. W. J. Bryan, with his accustomed ability and earnestness, in a signed interview that appeared in all the papers, reviewed the situation as to the Philippines and raised the cry of imperialism, with the manifest purpose of making it a national party issue. This interview did not lay down in precise terms what the Democratic policy would be, but closed with this significant statement:

What next? Investigation, discussion, action.

That was the position of Mr. Bryan on the 12th day of February, 1899, immediately after the ratification of the treaty. Investigation, discussion, and then action. What action he only indicated.

The interview was a warning to all Democrats not to go too far in the support of the Government's Philippine policy.

The Denver News, following that interview, in a series of editorials commenced to discuss and to investigate. One of these, which is characteristic of all and which shows how perplexed the editorial mind seemed to be, appeared in the paper, entitled "Filipinos are fighters." In it he went on to point out the very great difficulty ahead of us to conquer the Filipinos and subject everybody in the Philippine Islands to the authority of the United States. I would be glad to read it in full, but I will put it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and now only call attention to it, as I must do as to others, with the remark that even in connection with this there is no taking of any definite, pronounced position by this paper.

The article referred to is as follows:

[Denver Daily News, March 29, 1899.]

#### FILIPINOS ARE FIGHTERS.

Aguinaldo's insurgents are putting up a desperate fight. They are aided by the heat and the character of the country. Where they obtained so large a supply of modern arms and ammunition is a mystery in this country, although it may be known in official circles. The campaign is demonstrating the heroism and gallantry of the American soldiers, both volunteers and regulars. The insurgents will be beaten and the authority of the United States fully established in the islands. Whatever criticisms may be passed on the diplomacy that led up to this campaign, the direct result was the attack on our lines by Aguinaldo. That has left nothing to do but to fight it out.

Mr. FORAKER. Passing much that I would like to use, I come to April 5, 1899. The fighting commenced in February, 1899, and that is when the Denver News went back to the zealous advocacy of the assertion of our authority and the subordination of everybody in the Philippine Islands to it.

Immediately following that fighting, on the 12th of February, 1899, Mr. Bryan put out his interview, and then, as I said, the character of the editorials to which I have referred, which were not pronounced as to a definite policy but were only of a wavering and uncertain character, followed until this editorial of April 5, 1899. I will put this editorial in the RECORD to show whether after the 2d day of December, 1898, there was an advocacy of the independence at all times of the Filipinos in this paper.

Before I read it let me call attention to the fact that on the 1st day of April, 1899, just after the editorial was put out describing the Filipinos as such great fighters that it would be perhaps impossible, or well-nigh so, to conquer them, we captured Malolos, and the next thing the Denver News heard from the seat of war was that the capital of the insurgents had been captured and that their army had been put to rout, and it looked as though the whole thing was at an end. Now, see the character of the editorial we have:

[Editorial, Denver Daily News, April 5, 1899.]

#### THE FILIPINO CAMPAIGN.

The campaign in the Philippines may be regarded as ended. Aguinaldo's army is disbanding, and he is to all intents and purposes a fugitive. The most hopeful sign of the situation is the returning of the natives to their homes and the decoration of their houses with white flags. They were doubtless to a large extent terrorized by Aguinaldo and his army, and now that it is so completely beaten and disorganized and having seen practical demonstrations of American fighting, they will be all the more willing to submit to the authority of the United States. In all respects this campaign has been a brilliant one and has displayed the capacity of the American soldier for war. To officers and privates alike let full honor and praise be given.

Now that the natives are convinced of the power of the United States and of its stern determination to maintain that power, it ought to be an easy matter to pacify the islands and assure their inhabitants of the pacific intentions and beneficent purposes of the American Government. The Commission—

That is the Schurman Commission—

has arrived there at an opportune time, and is able to definitely announce the intentions and desires of this Government.

If they did announce those intentions and had announced those intentions, it would be to establish our authority as supreme in the islands.

This action ought to have a salutary effect on the Filipinos, who, freed from the odious tyranny and oppressive exactions and taxation of Spain, can look forward to a local government of their own, under the guidance and protection of the United States. But this guidance and protection must imply absolute obedience to the national power. This is the first lesson that the Filipinos must learn. Indeed, it is the first step that will enable them to become prepared for self-government. What liberty actually means they have not the remotest conception. When they know that it is a respect for law and order, for personal rights, and civic equality, then they will begin to appreciate the efforts that the United States is taking for the bettering of their condition. National independence is something beyond their ability to maintain at present, and can only come with the changed conditions that will follow American rule. To abrogate that now would be simply to open the archipelago to a prolonged war, in which every European power would strive to gain the mastery over them.

On the 7th day of April, 1899, he printed another editorial along the same line, entitled "Capacity for self-government," which is as follows:

#### CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT.

There is very much loose talk from the platforms and very many shallow editorials in various newspapers about self-government and independence for Cubans and Filipinos. Admitting that it all comes from the best of motives, the opinion must be expressed that much of it is based on the want of a proper knowledge or appreciation of existing conditions among those peoples.

Capacity for self-government is not a matter of sudden growth in any nation or among any people. It comes only as the result of long training and experience. In the new possessions which have fallen into our hands this lesson of self-government will have to be taught to their inhabitants. The native Cubans had thought that they would be permitted to retaliate on the Spanish residents for the tyranny they had suffered at the hands of the Madrid Government, and were surprised and indignant when they discovered that the United States would not permit such action. Their idea of freedom and independence was the privilege to practice the same despotism on others as they had endured. They did not understand that civil freedom to all means equal rights to all.

The same is substantially true of the Filipinos. Many of them, and no doubt honestly, entertain the belief that American occupation means the same kind of a rule that Spain enforced. The proclamation of the American Commission ought to undeceive them. By it the United States is pledged to grant civil and religious liberty, local self-government, an efficient and economical administration of the revenues for local purposes, a strict and impartial administration of justice, educational privileges, and whatever else may contribute to the welfare and progress of the Philippine people. But how to conduct their own affairs and administer government so as to secure the results is something these people will have to learn by observation and experience.

In the closing paragraph he employs this language:

In carrying to the people of these islands the gift of civil liberty and free institutions the United States can not be termed an oppressor. The talk of such men as convened in Boston the other evening is the rankest kind of lunacy. Freedom for any race or any people that do not know what freedom is and how to use it or what it means is the most dangerous and destructive thing that can be put in their hands.

I put this entire editorial in the RECORD so that I may not be guilty of a lack of candor or frankness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I can not question the Chair, but I commenced just 2 minutes after half past 11 and it now lacks 2 minutes of being a quarter to 12. I noted the time with great care. I took up some of the time on the amendment which I am discussing. I should like—

Mr. TELLER. I ask that the Senator from Ohio may have the two minutes or four minutes, whichever it is.

Mr. FORAKER. I am much obliged to the Senator from Colorado. If the Chair will let me have it I will hurry through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to say that the present occupant of the chair looked at the clock and thought that he was right in stating that the Senator's fifteen minutes had expired.

Mr. FORAKER. I understand that I have four minutes further, so that I will have time enough.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I will have to omit under pressure of want of time many of these editorials that I wanted to put in the RECORD. This one, and I call the attention of my distinguished friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to it, is an editorial in which a great many liberties are taken with a distinguished citizen of his State. I am reading it in order that the Senate may see its spirit and may determine whether in this paper there was nothing but an advocacy of independence for the Filipinos from and after December 2, 1898. He says as to Edward Atkinson.

[Editorial, Denver Daily News, May 3, 1899.]

#### EDWARD ATKINSON—TRAITOR.

Edward Atkinson has laid himself liable to an indictment and prosecution for treason. This notorious resident of Boston has long been a public nuisance. As an adept at making figures lie, he is the most successful man who ever posed as an "economist." For several years he has been denouncing the advocates of free silver coinage as "anarchists" and "repudiators," and as men who would "betray the national honor," for no other reason than that they demanded a return of the national policy to the system of coinage and finance established by Hamilton and Jefferson during the Presidency of Washington.

Having apparently exhausted his vocabulary of hard names and tirade perhaps of prevarication on the silver issue, he has more recently turned his attention to the expansion question, and with the same want of sense that has characterized his treatment of free silver coinage, he has abused and misrepresented all who differed from him, going at last one step too far and laying himself liable to an action for treason. In this case it is to be hoped that the United States district attorney will be instructed to proceed against him.

This is a country of free speech and free thought, and Mr. Atkinson has, with other citizens of the United States, a perfect right to enjoy those privileges. But when it comes to inciting mutiny and sedition among the soldiers of the United States, and to advising and encouraging rebellion against the authority of the United States, that is different. Such action is treasonable. The question is not whether expansion or antiexpansion is the proper national policy—that is a fair matter of discussion, and upon it the best of citizens and patriots may disagree; but no good citizen, no sincere patriot will, as this man Atkinson is charged with doing, incite mutiny, sedition, insurrection, or rebellion against the civil or military power of the National Government. If, as seems to be a well-established fact, Atkinson has done this, let him be punished as the law directs.

The sending of this man to the penitentiary and the consequent stopping of his antisilver, antiexpansion, alleged "economic" fulminations in the press and magazines would be a national benefit. It would abate a common nuisance and place beyond the power of doing further harm to many people the most accomplished mathematical liar of the age.

Now, Mr. President, I have almost concluded what I wish to put into the RECORD. My time is up. I suppose, however, under the rule I have a right to move to amend this amendment and to speak on that motion.



Mr. BERRY. Oh, no, Mr. President; there was no such understanding as that Senators could move amendments and continue their speeches upon them.

Mr. ALLISON. I will suggest to the Senator from Ohio that there will be some other amendments to be offered to the bill, upon which he may be heard.

Mr. FORAKER. I can speak on any other amendment, I understand, but I am almost through with what I was going to say. I am not going to say as much as I intended to, owing to the rule of limitation of debate under which we are proceeding, but I shall be glad if I may be allowed to put in two or three editorials without reading.

Mr. LODGE. I take it there will be ample time for the Senator to speak when other amendments come in. But I should be glad to complete the committee amendments, so that we may have a reprint of the bill by to-morrow with all of the amendments which have thus far been made.

Mr. FORAKER. Then, I will say, without stopping to read them, that if the Senate will give me leave to insert the other editorials to which I have referred so that they can appear in the RECORD I shall be content. I want them inserted together. They will show that the Denver News had many editorials long after the treaty was ratified in which it did not advocate the independence of the Filipinos, but the supreme authority of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

The editorial articles referred to are as follows:

[Editorial, Denver Daily News, May 19, 1899.]

#### END IS NEAR.

It looks as if the end of the Filipino rebellion is near. The last move of Aguinaldo in sending envoys to make peace on some terms indicates that he begins to realize that he is beaten and that the sooner he gives up the better. The Government has but one condition—unconditional surrender with a pledge of amnesty. Considering the long death roll and the cost of the campaign, no other nation on earth would grant such terms.

While these negotiations are going on Hale, Funston, and Lawton will be cleaning up the last remnants of the insurgent army. Gallant as other generals have shown themselves to be, Lawton is the man especially fitted to track down the scattering bands of Filipinos. His experience in the Apache campaign was a demonstration of his knowledge of this kind of warfare. Indifferent to hunger, thirst, fatigue, or hardship of any kind, not knowing what fear is, tireless in pursuit of an enemy, Geronimo said that Lawton never ate, never slept, "but all the heap fight." This is the man with the flying column, and the country need not be surprised at any time to hear that this Apache fighter has brought in Aguinaldo as a prisoner. If once directly on the trail of the insurgent chief, Lawton would follow him until he got him. A bloodhound is not more persistent than Lawton.

[Extract of editorial, Denver Daily News, May 21, 1899.]

#### THREE NATIONAL ISSUES.

The expansion question may or may not assume great prominence in the next campaign, and its particular form is still a matter of doubt. The present outlook is that it will be an object of criticism as to what has been done and the manner in which it was done, rather than a dispute as to what shall be done. If this shall be the case, it will be very far from a paramount issue, thus leaving the campaign to be fought out on silver and trusts and a clear issue to be made between the people and the money power.

[Editorial, Denver Daily News, May 23, 1899.]

#### TERMS OF PEACE.

Amnesty and local self-government—these are substantially the terms which the Government has offered the Filipino insurgents, and on which it insists on absolute surrender. It could offer nothing more. It could demand nothing less. The plan of government proposed is as liberal, if not more liberal, than Colorado enjoyed when it was a Territory, which New Mexico now enjoys, and which all of the Territories of the United States have always enjoyed. That Aguinaldo does not promptly accept the terms is a clear demonstration that he is using, or is now attempting to use, the Filipinos for his personal advantage. He wants some promises for himself. He is not entitled to any such consideration. In view of the number of brave American lives for which he is responsible, he ought to be satisfied to have his own life spared.

With these terms now so thoroughly understood by Aguinaldo, his generals, and the Filipino insurgents generally, there should be no cessation in the fighting until the rebellion is stamped out. No more envoys should be received unless they come with an absolute acceptance of the Government's terms, and demonstrate their good faith by laying down their arms. Heretofore they have been playing for time. They are shrewd fellows, these Malays, and hoped to reorganize their demoralized forces while their envoys were quibbling over terms of peace. No matter where their envoys are or what they are pretending to do the campaign should go right on. Continuous war is the shortest road to a permanent peace. The Filipinos now fully understand the only terms they can get, and until they make up their minds to accept them, let the fighting proceed.

[Editorial, Denver Daily News, May 23, 1899.]

#### MATTER OF METHODS.

Recent cablegrams from Manila have indicated differences of opinion between Major-General Otis and the members of the Philippine Commission. How radical these differences were the country has been left to surmise, but a Washington correspondent, with excellent means of knowing, asserts that they are of no especial consequence, being only that difference as to methods which would naturally arise between a military man accustomed to "stern measures" and civilians accustomed to "soft soap and diplomacy." This is probably the full extent of the alleged disagreement.

The average opinion of the country will be that General Otis is right. Before we can treat with these Filipinos, before peace and good order and civil government can be assured to these islands, before the sovereign power of the United States will be respected in the archipelago and the Orient, it will be necessary to establish unchallenged American authority. Then it will be possible to show what self-government under the United States really is. Then the Filipinos can be made to realize that they have not Spaniards to deal with or Spanish methods to combat.

At the present time, therefore, the shortest and surest road to a permanent peace is to continue the tactics of Hale, Lawton, and Funston. Actions, not proclamations, are just at this stage of the game the best peace promoters in the Philippines. Having offered amnesty and local self-government, it is now necessary to convince them that our promises are not of the kind that formerly emanated from Madrid. The greatest stumbling-block in the way of the submission of the Filipinos is their experience of two centuries with the captain-generals of Spain.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 14, line 21, after the word "found," I move to strike out "rock" and to insert "mineral."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 17, line 14, before the word "fraction," I move to insert "claim or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 37, line 7, after the word "section," I move to strike out "28" and insert "58."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 39, line 8, after the word "provinces," I move to insert the word "districts."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. At the beginning of line 9, on the same page, I move to strike out the word "corporations," and insert "municipalities."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On the same page, in line 10, before the word "purposes," I move to insert the word "public."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 40, line 7, before the word "only," I move to strike out the word "required," and insert "acquired."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 41, line 11, after the word "section," I move to strike out "64," and insert "66."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 42, after the word "section," at the end of line 22, I move to strike out "65," and insert "67."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 43, line 10, after the word "section," I move to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "sixty-seven."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 50, line 4, at the end of section 78, I move to insert the proviso, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 50, line 4, after the word "exercised," at the end of section 78, it is proposed to insert:

*Provided further, That it shall be unlawful for any corporation organized under this act, or for any person, company, or corporation receiving any grant, franchise, or concession from the government of the Philippine Islands to use, employ, or contract for the labor of persons held in slavery or involuntary servitude; and any person, company, or corporation so violating the provisions of this act shall forfeit all charters, grants, franchises, and concessions for doing business in the said Philippine Islands, and in addition shall be deemed guilty of an offense and shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$10,000.*

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I send to the desk an amendment to section 79, on page 50, which I ask to have read.

The SECRETARY. In section 79, on page 50, line 9, after the word "created," it is proposed to strike out:

*And every corporation authorized to engage in agriculture shall by its charter be restricted to the ownership and control of not to exceed 5,000 acres of land; and this provision shall be held to prevent any corporation engaged in agriculture from being in any wise interested in any other corporation engaged in agriculture.*

And in lieu thereof to insert:

*No corporation shall hereafter be authorized to engage in agriculture until and unless provision shall be made therefor under the law regulating the disposition of the public lands enacted in accordance with the provisions of section 12.*

Mr. BACON. I wish the Senator from Massachusetts would explain exactly what is the change that is made by that amendment.

Mr. LODGE. It makes it correspond with the change made in the section with regard to mining lands—that is, that there shall be no land granted to any corporation for agricultural purposes until land laws shall be drafted by the Philippine Commission and shall have been approved by the President of the United States and submitted to Congress.

Mr. BACON. Do I understand from that that it does away with the provision which contemplates the leasing of lands in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LODGE. That has already been taken out.

Mr. BACON. I did not know that.

Mr. LODGE. This simply provides that there shall be no grant to any corporation at any time, unless provided by law.

Mr. BACON. Do I understand that the entire section which contemplates the leasing of 5,000 acres of land to corporations has been eliminated?

Mr. LODGE. That has been entirely eliminated and remitted to future decision under the land laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 56, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in as a new section. I will say that it has been prepared by the Department of War and the Department of Justice. It is rendered necessary for the proper enforcement of certain laws in regard to vessels clearing from the Philippine Islands and the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 56, after line 20, it is proposed to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 96. The laws relating to entry, clearance, and manifests of steamships and other vessels arriving from or going to foreign ports shall apply to voyages each way between the Philippine Archipelago and the United States and the aforesaid possessions thereof, and all laws relating to the collection and protection of customs duties not inconsistent with the act of Congress of March 8, 1902, "temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands," shall apply in the case of vessels and goods arriving from the Philippine Islands in the United States and its aforesaid possessions.

The laws relating to seamen on foreign voyages shall apply to seamen on vessels going from the United States and its possessions aforesaid to the Philippine Archipelago, the customs officers there being for this purpose substituted for consular officers in foreign ports.

The provisions of chapters 6 and 7, title 48, Revised Statutes, so far as now in force, and any amendments thereof, shall apply to vessels making voyages either way between ports of the United States or its aforesaid possessions and ports in the Philippine Archipelago; and the provisions of law relating to the public health and quarantine shall apply in the case of all vessels entering a port of the United States or its aforesaid possessions from the Philippine Archipelago, where the customs officers at the port of departure shall perform the duties required by such law of consular officers in foreign ports.

Section 3005, Revised Statutes, as amended, and other existing laws concerning the transit of merchandise through the United States, shall apply to merchandise arriving at any port of the United States destined for any of its insular and continental possessions, or destined from any of them to foreign countries.

Nothing in this act shall be held to repeal or alter any part of the act of March 8, 1902, aforesaid, or to apply to Guam, Tutuila, or Manua.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in as a new section, and in connection with it I ask to have read the letter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated:

The SECRETARY. On page 56, after the amendment just adopted, it is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 97. That the treasury of the Philippine government shall be a place of deposit for such public moneys as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct.

Mr. LODGE. I now ask that the letter from the Secretary of War may be read, so that it may go into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, May 31, 1902.

SIR: We experience very great embarrassment in the Philippines owing to the fact that there is no authorized Government depository in the islands, and the disbursing officers of the Army, who are obliged to have in their possession very large amounts of money, have no right to deposit it in any institution in the Philippines. They are obliged, therefore, to keep the large sums required in the performance of their duties in specie in their trunks or office safes. The Secretary of the Treasury can make any national bank a Government depository, but as there are no national banks in the Philippines he has no such power there. Will you not secure the insertion in the Philippine bill of a clause making the treasury of the Philippine government a Government depository for the funds of the United States?

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,  
Secretary of War.

Hon. H. C. LODGE,  
Chairman Committee on the Philippines, United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]; which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I now ask that the numbers of the two succeeding sections may be changed to 98 and 99.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection the clerks will change the numbers of the sections to correspond to the amendments which have been made.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from Massachusetts is through with his amendments, I desire to call his attention to a small amendment, which I handed to him two or three days ago, in reference to the extension of the patent laws over the Philippine Archipelago. I only ask it because I should like to have him state to the Senate what is his judgment and that of the committee in reference to the matter.

Mr. LODGE. The committee considered the question of extending the copyright, the trade-mark, and patent laws to the Philippines, and omitted it from the bill, as they have a number of other matters, because they were of the opinion that those laws could be reenacted there if desired by the Philippine Commission; that it was a matter which could be safely left to them, and that it was better not to enter into the extension of laws where the Commission was able to deal with the subjects more satisfactorily upon the ground. For that reason the committee did not think it was necessary to put the provision in the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I simply asked the chairman of the committee to make this statement, for the reason that one or two very good lawyers have talked to me about the matter and handed me an amendment which they thought was necessary to attach to this bill.

Mr. LODGE. I have completed the offering of amendments to be proposed by the committee. The committee have no further amendments to propose and no further subjects of amendment under discussion.

I ask, for the convenience of the Senate, that the bill as amended may again be reprinted and furnished to Senators at the earliest possible moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the bill, as it has thus far been amended as in Committee of the Whole, may be reprinted. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, as I understand there are no further committee amendments to be offered, I desire to address the Senate for a few moments.

The discussion which has taken place, nominally in reference to the bill to provide for the administration of civil affairs in the Philippine Islands, has seemed to me to be very peculiar indeed. The great part of the discussion has not been in reference to the bill, but about matters that have long since taken place and are finally settled. We have been favored with accounts and incidents of ancient and modern wars, and ancient history has been resorted to in the speeches which have been made concerning the conduct of the American soldiers in the Philippines.

Mr. President, the war with Spain resulting in the acquisition of the Philippine Islands was reluctantly engaged in by the conservative members of the Republican party. The members of both parties in Congress voted for the resolutions declaring war. The members of both parties in the Senate voted unanimously for an appropriation of \$50,000,000 to carry on the war. The Spanish fleets in Santiago and Manila harbors were destroyed and that war soon ended. A commission was sent to Paris to negotiate a treaty of peace. That treaty provided for the cession of the Philippine Islands to the United States at a cost of \$20,000,000. That treaty never would have been ratified without the aid of Democratic Senators. The appropriation of \$20,000,000 to pay for the Philippine Islands was voted by both Houses, I believe, almost unanimously. That war, whatever may have been its cost to the United States, has placed us in a position among the nations of the world which we could not have acquired by a century of peace. The United States is now recognized by all nations as one of the great world powers.

The President governed the islands, as Commander in Chief under the Constitution, from the date when the treaty was signed until the passage of the Army appropriation bill during the closing days of the last Congress. But all this has passed and gone, and there is no need of discussing that part of our history.

Neither is there anything to be gained by discussing the relation of the Philippine Archipelago to the United States from a legal standpoint. The relationship which those islands bear to us has been decided by our court of last resort, and whether that decision is right or wrong it stands as the supreme law of this land until reversed by a subsequent decision.

Two Commissions have been sent to the Philippines, one for preliminary investigation and the second the Taft Commission. The first Commission has long since finished its labors and made its report, and the second Commission, which has been reorganized into a civil government, with William H. Taft as governor, is now in the islands nobly carrying out the purposes for which it was appointed. Every act of that Commission has been suspiciously scrutinized and examined; the civil governor of the islands and the head of the Commission has been examined and cross-examined and reexamined by the committee reporting the bill under consideration, but the most careful examination has failed to disclose any wrongdoing or, in fact, any substantial objection to the work being carried on by the civil government.

Failing to find in the civil governor or the civil government any substantial objection, the minority turned its attention to the Army of the United States, and for weeks we have been hearing of "the tortures," as the minority members of the Philippine Committee are pleased to term it, which our American soldiers have inflicted on the poor, downtrodden, guiltless Filipino.

More than three years have passed since Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in the waters of Manila Harbor. Taking into account all the embarrassments and difficulties which we had to encounter, considering the character of the people of the islands, considering the resistance of a portion of the Filipinos, led by adroit and unscrupulous leaders, to the authority of the United States, the success which has attended our efforts has been wonderful, and the country and the world so regard it. It may seem a long time since we first took possession of the Philippines, but we must remember the vast area covered by that archipelago,



119,000 square miles, including about 1,700 islands, many of the islands being so large that they may be considered separate and distinct countries, inhabited by different tribes, speaking different languages.

Senators upon the other side have criticised the conduct of the war and of our soldiers. The truth is, the American people today believe that the speeches made by our Democratic friends have been in the main an attack upon the American army in the Philippines. Scarcely a word has been uttered in condemnation of the treachery, the fearful outrages, and cowardly butchery of our soldiers by the Filipinos, without excuse or extenuating circumstances. The majority of the Democrats in this Senate who have spoken are simply on the side of the Filipino, and they have excused the Filipino and condemned without stint the conduct of the American soldier, if, perchance, the latter under exasperating conditions is found guilty or is charged with unusual punishment of the Filipino.

Now, Mr. President, I do not approve of the water cure or any other conduct of our soldiers not authorized by civilized warfare. But in their zeal for the Filipino, for whom their hearts seem to overflow with mistaken sympathy, they have become a "fire-in-the-rear" party, and have succeeded in convincing the country that they believe the American army in the Philippine Islands is unworthy of a free and liberty-loving people. Some of the officers, some of the men, have done things to be condemned. No great army ever was or ever will be entirely free from fault in some particulars, but, as an army, its men are brave, humane, patriotic, whose hearts are noble as they are brave, and should be so held by our people, and are so regarded.

If the speeches that have been made by Senators are to be taken as conclusive of the situation and the conduct of our Army in the Philippines, one would be led to believe that our Army is composed of a band of barbarians, who are engaged in torturing and oppressing and robbing the Filipinos of their natural rights, and that the people of the islands are in complete revolt against American sovereignty. How different are the facts! The islands are governed by as able a body of men as the country affords; part of the Commission, in charge of the civil government, is composed of native Filipinos; hundreds of towns have been organized under the municipal code; the elective franchise has been given; American teachers have been sent from the United States by the shipload, and American soldiers, instead of torturing, have been teaching the Filipino. Thousands of Filipino children are being given the benefit of free schools. Courts have been established, some presided over by Filipinos, and some by able American lawyers. Great public improvements have been made.

But all this has been gone over fully. The argument of those opposed to this bill seems to be that because the people are content, as is alleged, to live in a condition of ignorance, without schools, without commerce, without knowledge of the fact that their condition can be improved, that they ought to be let alone, to live on for the centuries to come in their own way, of no use to themselves or to the world around them. Every Senator here knows that in every settlement and province where peace has been secured the people are in a better condition and are being treated better than they ever were before. Those islands have come to us as the result of war and treaty. They belong to the United States, and it is our duty, from which as an honorable nation we can not retreat, to take hold of the situation, enforce our authority, build them up, better their condition, give them liberty, give them intelligence, and make them a useful people. That can not be done by the policy adopted by our friends, who are constantly complaining against every step that has been taken in the great work in which our Army is engaged in enforcing our national authority and in trying to erect civil government in the hands of the Filipinos whenever it can safely be done. When it seems clear to the Republican party to move forward, our Democratic friends hold back; when we think it wise to go slow, they are in great haste.

To my mind, Mr. President, the opposition developed to this bill seems strange and unnatural. The great body of the people do not understand it. They believe, in the first place, in the nation doing what it undertakes; in the second place, the people always did and always will repudiate and condemn a fire in the rear party; and, in the third place, they believe by the aid and care of the United States of those people they will some day be capable of self-government and independence; and everybody knows they are not capable of independence now.

It has been asserted that the American Army has burned towns and villages. That is true. They have done so, but only as a necessary incident of war. War, as some one said, is not a lawn party. One of our great American generals said, and said truthfully, "War is hell." It means blood; it means death; it means destruction. The United States Army was sent to the Philippines for the purpose of stamping out the insurrection and establishing the authority of the United States, and it has done so.

The situation as it has appeared in this Senate for six or seven

weeks has reminded me of the situation in the country in 1864, just before the collapse of that great civil war. Those opposed to the Republican party met in solemn national convention and resolved that the war was a failure, demanded immediate cessation of hostilities, a convention of the States, and an early peace.

If our friends opposed to this bill will possess their souls with patience the war in the Philippines will soon be over and the Filipinos will be given greater liberty, peace, and prosperity than they have ever known before.

Cases have been cited and witness after witness has been examined before the Philippine Committee showing that in some cases the so-called water cure has been administered. From the examination which I have been able to make of the testimony, in each case where this cure was administered it was not done for pleasure or out of wanton cruelty. It was done where some atrocious crime had been committed by the Filipinos, where arms were concealed and it was necessary to the safety of our own soldiers to secure such arms in order that they might not be used against them by the Filipinos, or for some similar purpose, or the witness testifying to the water cure was not cognizant of the reason why it was administered.

So I think, Mr. President, that the testimony will show in most of the cases of alleged cruelty on the part of our soldiers that there was some aggravation that made the American soldier desperate and to feel that retaliation was justifiable.

When we are informed by the Secretary of War that the war on the part of the Filipinos has been conducted with barbarous cruelty; that the Filipino troops have frequently fired upon our men from under protection of flags of truce, tortured to death American prisoners who have fallen into their hands, buried alive both American and friendly natives, and horribly mutilated the bodies of the American dead, does not the so-called water cure seem very mild in comparison with the conduct of the Filipino?

That our soldiers or officers should have found it necessary to resort to these practices we all deplore and regret, as has been stated over and over again by many Senators on this side.

What I desire, and what we on this side have desired all the time, is that the Filipino shall have as complete a self-government as it is possible to give them. This bill is designed to confirm civil government and to do away with military government when it is safe to do so. It seems to be the purpose of the opposition to prevent the establishment of civil government by eternally discussing the enormities of civil war, and the time has come when, if we want these people to have increased liberty, we should relegate the soldier and the Army to the rear and civil government to the front.

Whether this bill, in all its details, is correct I do not undertake to say. It has been considered and favorably reported to the Senate by a committee composed of able and experienced Senators and legislators, who have considered it carefully. If it is not proper in all its details let us take it up and amend it and pass it, if a majority of the Senate shall determine that it is a proper bill to pass.

Mr. President, as my time has about expired, I desire to have inserted a portion of the testimony taken before the Committee on the Philippines, containing the reason in each case (so far as I have been able to gather it from the testimony), why the water cure was administered. I think it is only fair to our soldiers that this testimony, showing in each case the excuse or justification of the conduct of our soldiers, should be printed in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the matters referred to will be inserted in the RECORD as a part of the Senator's remarks.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Testimony of Governor Taft, p. 75.]

KNOWS NOTHING, OF HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE, CONCERNING WATER CURE.

I have no doubt there were such instances. Of course a great many more than there ought to have been; but dependence upon private letters from private individuals as to what occurred is dependence on a very broken reed. I did not realize the unreliability of such letters until I experienced what it was. But I was at Manila during all this time. I was there when charges of this kind were being made. I was in daily conference with General MacArthur and knew the position he took and knew the position his subordinates took with respect to it.

But I was explaining some time since the circumstances of provocation to a violation of duty on the part of officers and sergeants, who, by force of circumstances, were placed in irresponsible control to show you that it might have occurred and still have been in the teeth of instructions of the responsible officers. I will tell you what General Bell told me in a conversation. It is sufficient to describe it as a mutilation which was likely to outrage the feelings of any person. A man's bunkie—a bunkie is his chum—comes along and finds a soldier, the man with whom he has been associated, mutilated in an outrageous way; a man whom he had seen alive an hour before. You must understand that a soldier has human nature and that things are done which a commanding officer would not approve and yet can not be prevented because of the outrage of feeling. That is the explanation of a good many things."

[Testimony of Gen. Robert P. Hughes, pp. 654 and 655.]

Heard of but one case of water cure, as we understand the meaning of that term here. That case was administered by the police by what you might call a police force, and they said they would not do it again. They were



Americans. They had heard of it, I presume, and they tried it, and my information was that they would never try it again.

I have read a paper since I came home emanating from Boston describing it, and I can assure you, Senator, that the thing was not practiced under my command, or at least I think I am sufficiently well advised as to what was being done to say that that was never practiced in the Department of Visayas. The best information I had is that they tried it in one case and rejected it. I did not know of that case until long afterwards.

[Letter of General Funston (p. 851) to the Adjutant-General.]

In this extract [from Philadelphia paper, January 2, 1902] it is alleged that a soldier who claims to have been with me in the Philippines made the statement that he had helped to administer the water cure to 100 natives, all but 26 of whom died. This statement I wish to brand as a lie, without the slightest foundation in facts. During my service of three years in the Philippines I never had any personal knowledge of the so-called water cure being administered to a native or any other form of torture being used to extract information from them. \* \* \* It is my belief that the water cure was very rarely if ever administered by American soldiers. It was resorted to occasionally by Macabebe scouts, who were not under the control of some officer, to obtain information as to the whereabouts of concealed arms and ammunition. They did this without orders from superiors.

[Letter from Secretary Root to the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, dated February 17, 1902.]

In reply to an inquiry as to the water cure and other tortures being administered by American soldiers, the Secretary of War says:

"Every report or charge of this description which has at any time been brought to the notice of the War Department has been made the subject of prompt investigation, and among the inclosed papers you will find the records of 13 such inquiries in which the results have been reported. You will perceive that in substantially every case the report has been proved to be either unfounded or grossly exaggerated."

The Secretary of War inclosed copy of instructions for the government of the armies of the United States, first promulgated by President Lincoln, which are now in force in the Philippines:

"RULE 16. Military necessity does not admit of cruelty, that is, the infliction of suffering for the sake of suffering, or for revenge, or of maiming or wounding, except in fight, nor of torture to extort confessions.

"RULE 44. All wanton violence committed against persons in the invaded territory, all destruction of property not commanded by the authorized officer, all robbery, all pillage or sacking, even after taking a place by main force, all rape, wounding, maiming, or killing such inhabitants are prohibited under the penalty of death or such other severe punishment as may seem adequate for the gravity of the offense.

"The war on the part of the Filipinos has been conducted with barbarous cruelty, common among uncivilized races, and with general disregard of the rules of civilized warfare. They deliberately adopted the policy of killing all natives however peaceful who were friendly to our Government. Literally, in thousands of instances these poor creatures, depending upon our soldiers for protection, have been assassinated.

"The Filipino troops have frequently fired upon our men from under protection of flags of truce, tortured to death American prisoners who have fallen into their hands, buried alive both American and friendly natives, and horribly mutilated the bodies of the American dead. That the soldiers fighting against such an enemy and with their own eyes witnessing such deeds should occasionally be regardless of the orders and retaliate by unjustifiable severities is not incredible. Such things happen in every war, even between two civilized nations, and they always will happen while war lasts. That such occurrences have been sanctioned or permitted is not true. A constant and effective pressure of prohibition, precept, and discipline has been maintained against them. That there has been any such practice is not true. The cases have been few and far between, scattered infrequently over a great area of country, along the course of three years of active conflict, through thousands of engagements, and among many thousands of troops. That these occasional cases have characterized our Army or its conduct is not true, any more than the deeds of lawless violence which constantly occur in every large city characterize the people of the city. The war in the Philippines has been conducted by the American Army with scrupulous regard for the rules of civilized warfare, with careful and genuine consideration for the prisoner and noncombatant, with self-restraint, and with humanity never surpassed if ever equaled in any conflict, worthy only of praise, and reflecting credit upon the American people."

[Letter of Capt. Matthew A. Batson, Fifteenth United States Cavalry, replying to newspaper accounts concerning the water cure, p. 932.]

I have heard a great deal about the water cure, and do not doubt it has been applied in a few cases. Outrages will be committed in any army in the world. They have been committed against our own citizens, in our own country, by our own soldiers. But I know that such methods were not sanctioned, as alleged in the article referred to, by the military authorities in the Philippines, and that when such proof could be obtained that such methods have been practiced the offenders were promptly brought to justice.

[Report of Cornelius Gardener concerning the province of Tayabas, dated December 15, 1901, p. 884.]

Being in close touch with the people, having visited all of the pueblos one or more times, having lived with them in their homes, I know that such (friendly) sentiment once existed. Of late, by reason of the conduct of the troops, such as the extensive burning of barrios in trying to lay waste the country so that the insurgents can not occupy it, the torturing of natives by so-called water cure and other methods in order to obtain information, the harsh treatment of natives generally, and of failure of inexperienced lately appointed lieutenants commanding posts to distinguish between those who are friendly and those unfriendly and treating every native as if he were, whether or no, an insurgent at heart, this favorable sentiment is being fast destroyed and a deep hatred for us engendered. If these things need be done they had best be done by native troops, so that the people of the United States will not be credited therewith.

The work of the Philippine Commission and the laws that have been enacted by it are everywhere favorably commented upon by the natives. The efforts being made for the general education of the people are appreciated by all. The provincial government and municipal governments established are slowly bringing order out of chaos and anarchy, and there begins to be visible everywhere in this province progress and prosperity. True loyalty and contentment can only come under civil government.

[November 27, 1900, Charles S. Riley testifies that water cure was practiced upon presidente of Igaras, Iloilo, pp. 1527-1538.]

Was in Philippines about eighteen months; during this time this was the only instance of water cure I witnessed; I know of no other instances except hearsay from other men.

1538: The reason the cure was administered to the presidente was that information had been obtained from native sources as to his being an insurgent officer. After the treatment he admitted that he held the rank of captain in the insurgent army—an active captain. His police force, numbering 25, were

sworn insurgent soldiers. He was the presidente of the town and had been for years, and he always showed himself to be friendly on the outside to the officers and men the same way.

Two treatments were administered. The first to find out whether it was true that he had been treacherous to the American cause, and the second to find out whether warnings had been given to the insurgents of our arrival.

[Testimony of William Lewis Smith, p. 1543.]

Testifies to same case as did Riley, namely, that water cure was administered to the presidente of Igaras, November 27, 1900, who was accused of treachery.

Also saw water cure administered to two police of same town about same time as to the presidente.

Page 1546: The reason the water cure was administered to these police was that they swore that the whole force of the town of Igaras had sworn allegiance to the presidente any time they were called to take arms against American troops in the town. They swore to that after the water cure was administered. I do not know positively, but, as I understand it, the water cure was administered for the purpose of compelling information.

[Testimony of Edward J. Davis, p. 1723.]

Testifies to same cases as do Riley and William Lewis Smith, namely, water cure being administered to presidente and police of Igaras on November 27, 1900.

Page 1731: Does not know positively why cure was administered, but think they discovered he was captain of insurgents and police; he pretended to be a friend of the Americans at the same time.

On same day also saw American soldiers take the schoolmaster of the town, who was a native, and place a couple of Colt's revolvers at his head instead of the water cure. These were the only four cases of cruelty I witnessed.

[Testimony of Grover Flint, p. 1765.]

Was lieutenant of the Thirty-fifth Infantry; was in the Philippines November, 1899, to April, 1901.

Witnessed the water cure to Filipinos early in May, 1900. The Macabebe scouts, as the towns were approached, would enter the houses and pull out these men and talk with them and take them down to the well and put them through this test, and the men would go off and get the guns. This was done entirely on this occasion by Macabebe scouts to get knowledge of where guns were concealed. After the application of the test we got the guns. On the following day the same thing was repeated and our men took a little part in it, apparently as volunteers. They were not ordered to do so. I witnessed quite a number of cases. I never saw a man die from the torture. I should think about 30 were put through the first evening and perhaps 20 the next morning.

[Testimony of Leroy E. Hallock, p. 1939.]

Was a sergeant, Company I, Twenty-sixth Volunteers; arrived in the Philippines October 27, 1899, left March 6, 1901.

Saw the water cure administered at Leon to about ten or a dozen natives captured that were thought to be implicated in the murder of O'Hearn, a member of our company. The confession of the natives was that O'Hearn was roasted over a slow fire and then hacked to death by bolos. What led to the capture of these natives it was reported that Captain Glenn or some soldiers under his orders gave the water cure to a native and he confessed and told who the others were that took part in the killing of O'Hearn, and these members of our company captured these natives and gave them the water cure and they confessed to having had a part in the killing. The water cure was administered by orders of the first sergeant.

The water cure was given to them on two different days—on August 21, 1900, and August 23, 1900.

Witness also testified to the burning of a town 8 miles from Leon, which had eight or ten thousand inhabitants.

Of the 12 who were captured and to whom the water cure was administered, 5 were shot while attempting to escape, the rest got away with the exception of one, and I think he was released.

[Testimony of D. J. Evans, p. 2060.]

Served in the Regular Army six years; in the Philippines from April, 1899, to February, 1901; was a corporal.

Witnessed the water cure to a native in the Ilanico Province, at Ilocos Norte. The water cure was administered by scouts for the Americans; they tried to get him to tell where the rest of the insurgents were at that time. We knew about where they were, but we did not know how to get to them. They were in the hills, and it happened that there was but one path that could get to them. He refused to tell this one path and they commenced this so-called water cure. While the water was given by natives an American soldier struck this native in the pit of the stomach as hard as he could strike him many times, and it made the native very sick. I believe he told, because I did not hear of any more water cure inflicted upon him. Think there was a lieutenant present at the time.

I know of five towns being burned myself. These towns were composed of bamboo houses, containing probably 20 or 25 huts in a village.

[Testimony of Richard V. Hughes, p. 2236.]

Served in the Philippines as a private soldier from October, 1900, to October, 1901.]

Observed the water cure on one occasion; think it was on the 26th of September, 1901. Left Magdalena with a detachment of a company under command of Lieutenant Merchant to capture some rifles supposed to be in a cartel about 6 miles distant, and also some insurgents. We arrived there early in the morning, and found the bird had flown, as was generally the case. Lieutenant Merchant seemed provoked that the insurgent leader had gotten away and that we could get no information, and he had a private strike this native and knock him down; he then could not give any information in regard to the whereabouts of this insurgent leader, and he was knocked down a second time, and after that Lieutenant Merchant saw he could not get any information, and he proceeded to the cartel.

The guide we brought with us from Magdalena told us we would find arms and soldiers in that place, but they had gone. Lieutenant Merchant was under the impression that the guide was prevaricating, and he lectured him and had him whipped by two natives with a branch of a tree, and then had the water cure administered to him. This was the only case of water cure I ever saw. He could not give any further information, and the Lieutenant had him whipped again and had some more water poured down his mouth. On leaving there the Lieutenant had the houses burned, and of course the women had to get out, and he left this crippled woman there without any house, and everything they had was burned.

[Testimony of Isador H. Dube, p. 2243.]

I was a sergeant in the Twenty-sixth Infantry for sixteen or seventeen months. I saw the water cure administered. I was on guard. I don't remember the date nor the month. I was in command at Jaro, Panay, and some natives were confined in the guardhouse by order of Captain Glenn; and I was sent with this native to bring him over to Lieutenant Congor's house, which I did; and Lieutenant Congor and Captain Glenn and two or three privates administered the water cure to this native; I do not know for



what cause, but the native appeared to me to be a sort of wealthy and intelligent native. He had some education. I do not think that was necessary. I do not know what the circumstances were. That is the only case of water cure I ever saw.

I saw another punishment inflicted. There was a native woman. I was in command of the guard, and there were about fourteen or fifteen prisoners in a back room which we used as a cell, and a woman was ordered to be confined among those prisoners—a native woman. I asked the post commander where this woman was to be confined. He says, "Why, right in with the other prisoners." There was nothing but one room, and I think she was kept in there over three weeks by order of Major Glenn. The woman was 40 years old, and the prisoners varied from 15 to 40 years old. I do not know that the woman was submitted to any indignity by being placed in confinement with the men.

Saw several houses burned in Panay—bamboo houses—and a great quantity of rice.

Two natives were murdered in the town I was in, and one prisoner was cut with daggers by natives; they were supposed to be in sympathy with the Americans.

Lieutenant Wagner started to go to a neighboring town about 20 miles away, on horseback, and he was instantly killed—shot through the forehead.

[Testimony of Janareous Manning, p. 2251.]

Was first sergeant in the Philippines from October, 1899, to March, 1901.

Saw the water cure administered on the 20th of August, 1900, in that town of Leon to prisoners captured for the murder of Private O'Hearn; they were captured the day before, and to get them to tell what they knew about the murder we had to give them the water cure to get it. I directed it to be given by order of Captain Gregg. He ordered me to see that they were not abused; to see that they did not get too much. I would not swear that he ordered me to give them the water cure. When we brought these prisoners in and put them under oath, they knew nothing about the murder of O'Hearn; but the ringleader the day before the body was recovered admitted that he helped to murder him, and he implicated ten or eleven more men. I understand the ringleader had the water cure applied to him the day before, though I was not there. After the application of the water cure they did tell; they first told on the other men and afterwards implicated themselves.

We gave the water cure more than once to some who would not tell on themselves or anyone else two days afterwards, but in the meantime they had been told on by others to whom the water cure had been applied. The first man who gave the information of O'Hearn was the presidente of the town of Miguel. He gave the information to the Gordon scouts, and they telegraphed up to the captain to meet them out there next day near the town. The captain took a detachment out and got O'Hearn's body or the bones under the roots of a tree in a little hole, and they took in between fifteen or twenty prisoners. There was never any doubt in my mind, and so far as I know in the minds of other Americans present, but that these men who received the water cure were responsible and really did murder and burn O'Hearn.

(This was the same case testified to by Hallock, namely, that Private O'Hearn was tied to a tree by natives, burned by a slow fire, and cut to pieces by bolos.)

Q. What did you understand to be the direction and desires of General Hughes and your other superior officers as to the treatment that should be given by you and other soldiers to the people in general who were peaceably inclined as to care and kindness and consideration, or the reverse?

A. The orders were to treat everyone right and treat them kindly.

This man from our country was murdered by the Filipinos, and three men from Company F were also murdered at Calinog.

I have seen a half dozen or so barrios burn, varying in size from 15 to 30 huts each.

[Testimony of George G. Boardman, p. 2310.]

Was in the Regular Army in the Philippines; landed there in February, 1899, and has just returned.

This witness only knew of one case of the water cure, and this was done in order to secure information where guns and ammunition could be found, and afterwards witness and others found 17 guns.

The testimony of the witness is somewhat mixed, but it would appear that a native Filipino boy, 17 years of age, was murdered in the market place by native Filipinos because he had joined the American forces. This murder was committed in the presence of the American soldiers, and the Filipinos probably shot to kill the soldiers as well as the boy. Witness concludes by saying:

"If we left them, the natives, and did not secure their arms and ammunition, they would attack us the next day with those same guns; so we knew by experience that it was necessary to protect our lives to secure the ammunition and guns, and the one I saw the application of the water cure given to was not hurt in the least. He was pretty badly scared; he said himself he could not tell, but he said another party would tell. The other party did tell and he went off and found 17 guns."

(This all occurred in the Batangas Province, where the war is still being carried on.)

See page 2228 for further particulars.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard for fifteen minutes on the bill, and then, possibly, for ten minutes on the substitute, if it is agreeable to the Senate. Otherwise I will consume fifteen minutes now and later in the day will conclude my remarks.

Mr. TELLER. I do not understand that the Senator from Illinois can have fifteen minutes on the bill and then ten minutes on the substitute.

Mr. MASON. Very well. I say, if there is any objection—

Mr. TELLER. I do not object, but I want to keep within the rule, because we can not afford to violate one of these unanimous-consent agreements.

Mr. MASON. I will simply have to wait until later in the day to present the other part of my remarks.

Mr. TELLER. I understand a Senator can speak fifteen minutes, and when an amendment is before the Senate he can speak fifteen minutes again. I think it would not be fair for any Senator to take the floor and speak fifteen minutes on one amendment and then take up another amendment and speak on it, and so on. I do not think that would be within the spirit of the agreement, which is that there are to be speeches limited to fifteen minutes at a time, and then the Senator must give way to some one else.

Mr. MASON. I will ask unanimous consent that my speech

may go into the RECORD together. There will be no objection to that request.

Mr. TELLER. There will be no objection to it.

Mr. MASON addressed the Senate. After having spoken fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MASON. I beg to question the accuracy of the Chair. I started, if this clock is right and has not been stopped—

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Illinois will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois started at twenty-seven minutes after 12 o'clock.

Mr. MASON. We look at the clock from different points of view. I wish to say to the Chair that I do not question anything except that he is looking at the clock from the wrong point of view. [Laughter.]

Mr. TELLER. I have been trying to afford the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to continue his remarks. I offer an amendment and ask that it be read. I offer it now as an amendment. I gave notice of it the other day. Then the Senator from Illinois can proceed on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of section 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. That all inhabitants of the Philippine Islands continuing to reside therein who were Spanish subjects on the 11th day of April, 1899, and then resided in the Philippine Islands, and their children born subsequent thereto, except such as shall have elected to preserve their allegiance to the Crown of Spain in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain entered into on the 11th day of April, 1899, shall be deemed and held to be citizens of the government of the Philippine Islands and as such entitled to the protection of the United States and all the rights and privileges of the bill of rights as enumerated in section 2 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this amendment the Senator from Illinois may address the Senate.

Mr. MASON resumed and concluded his speech, which in its entirety is as follows:

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, in Herbert Spencer's last book, just published, *Facts and Comments*, speaking of slavery, he says:

Let me begin with the earliest and simplest, which well serves to symbolize the whole.

Here is a prisoner, with his hands tied and a cord round his neck (as suggested by figures in Assyrian bas-reliefs), being led home by his savage conqueror, who intends to make him a slave. The one, you say, is captive and the other free? Are you quite sure the other is free? He holds one end of the cord, and unless he means to let his captive escape he must continue to be fastened by keeping hold of the cord in such way that it can not easily be detached. He must be himself tied to the captive while the captive is tied to him. In other words, his activities are impeded and certain burdens are imposed on him. A wild animal crosses the track, and he can not pursue. If he wishes to drink of the adjacent stream, he must tie up his captive lest advantage be taken of his defenseless position. Moreover, he has to provide food for both. In various ways, then, he is no longer completely at liberty; and these ways adumbrate in a simple manner the universal truth that the instrumentalities by which the subordination of others is effected themselves subordinate the victor, the master, or the ruler.

Mr. President, I am not here representing the Filipino. While I can not find words in the short time I have to speak to-day to express the sorrow I feel for that poor unhappy people in the Philippine Islands, I beg to be heard in behalf of the man at the other end of the cord, our people who are citizens of the United States, covered and protected by the Constitution which we have sworn solemnly to uphold.

I believe with Herbert Spencer, the philosopher, and with Abraham Lincoln, the patriot, that no man is good enough to govern another without that other man's consent, and therefore no nation is good enough to govern another nation without that other nation's consent. No man can be free who owns a slave, and no nation is free that holds another nation in subjugation. I desire to be free from unkindness, and certainly shall not deal in harsh criticism, notwithstanding the almost brutal assaults that have been made upon me for having simply expressed my opinion on these questions according to the best light which God has given me.

I can not find words to express my feelings when I hear learned Senators, who are familiar with our form of government, talking about "giving" liberty to other people. That we may start right let me read to you in four lines what Daniel Webster thought of one people "giving" liberty to another:

No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulders, if it is not imposed by the voice of his own nation and of his own country, he will not, he can not, and he means not to be happy under its burden.

I wish to read just two lines from the president of the first Commission, Dr. Schurman, which he spoke day before yesterday:

The Filipinos will never be content until we allow them to govern themselves.

In the multitude of changes that occur in the march of time, principles never change. That principle was true when Webster pronounced it; when Hungary sought to lift the yoke of Austria.

It was true on the day of the Boston tea party. It was true when the little republics of South America, under the guidance of Bolivar, shook off the yoke of Spain. It was true in Cuba, until they were able to set their own flag in the sky. It is true to-day in South Africa; and it is true to-day, God help us, in the far-off island of Luzon.

I have no disposition to find fault, or to debate long and loud upon the facts. Enough of the facts are agreed upon to show that the purchase of the Philippine Islands, and our attempt to govern them, is the saddest and most unhappy mistake our beloved country has made since the day we began to traffic in slaves. How much, under the law of compensation, we must pay in the future for this mistake the all-wise God only knows. The amount we have already paid for this mistake the human mind can neither compute nor comprehend. The money we have spent would make a chain of gold that would encircle the world.

It would construct our Nicaragua Canal over and over again. One year of our expenditure upon the Philippines would redeem every acre of our arid land and make the American desert to blossom as the rose. Our total expenses there would pay the salaries of the President, the Cabinet, and Senators for a thousand years. It would more than double the public buildings of the nation. It would more than pay our annual pension roll. It would provide for our rivers and harbors for a quarter of a century. The human mind can hardly comprehend the hundreds of millions of dollars which we have taken from the people's pockets in this mighty national blunder. I am speaking now not of the slave but of the man, the master, at the other end of the chain.

Who will estimate the cost in other things? Who will count our heroic dead? I remember very well begging and protesting against this war in the Philippines, when one distinguished Senator said that if there was war a regiment of bluecoats would march across the archipelago and make peace.

Ten thousand American boys have gone to their long home, and the end is not yet. Coffin them, beginning here at the Senate Chamber, and lay them out for the world to see. March by the row of coffins until you have seen the faces of thousands of our heroic dead. Look, then, beyond into the desolate homes of mourning and despair; count, weigh, or measure, if you can, the tears of the widow and the orphan. Then, go to St. Elizabeth's Asylum, within a gunshot of the Senate Chamber, and estimate if you can the misery of the hopelessly insane whom we have brought back from the climate of the Philippines, and after looking into the faces of those who are worse than dead, then blame me, if you can and will, for pleading here to-day for Herbert Spencer's man—for the American master at our end of the chain.

The most dramatic story in mythology that reminds one of our country's situation to-day is the story of the Minotaur, who demanded of a certain government that they should send to his cave annually six of their choicest youths to be devoured by this monster. I remember to have seen a picture of these unhappy youths, painted by some master hand, embarking in a boat and setting sail to meet their doom.

If our present war is to continue, the Minotaur in the Philippine Islands demands many more than six victims from every State represented here. Will you, Mr. President, and you my brother Senators, go into the families of your States and select them? If this bill becomes a law, it means a continuance of the present policy, and a continuance of the war. The State of Lincoln, Grant, and Logan will continue, must continue, to furnish her share of graves. But if to-day this body should promise ultimate freedom and independence to the Filipinos, as soon as we found them capable of self-government, every native would lay down his gun and bolo and patiently await the pleasure of the United States, as the people have in Cuba.

There is honest difference of opinion upon this question, some declaring that the natives are not ready for self-government and others asserting that they are; and by reason of these differences this mighty price of blood and treasure is being paid. Why should we longer debate the question when we can resolve the doubt by giving a trial, without the cost of a life or a dollar in money?

I am but one who believes that every nation and every community can form a government that fits its own needs, and that self-government comes only through the open gate of opportunity and along the rough and rugged road of experience. Others believe that you can teach the art of governing, as you would teach swimming, by writing essays, or the art of painting, drawing, or music without the great factor of practice.

Learned Senators have read by the hour the opinions of distinguished gentlemen as to what would occur if we promised them a chance to try to govern themselves. Why waste the time, money, and the precious lives of American citizens waiting for wise men to guess at what results may follow, when the naked truth, the fact itself, lies before us if we will but open the book of experience and read. Tens of thousands of American people, looking to our experience in Cuba, believe that the promise that

the Filipinos should ultimately have the chance to try the doctrine of self-government would make peace and save the lives of our boys and the honor of the nation.

We do not know that we are right; you do not know that you are right; but we all know that we can settle the question in twenty-four hours by making an honest effort in that direction. We have our line of logic and you have yours. In support of our logic we have every line of experience recorded in history to sustain our contention; not ancient history, where precedent may be shattered by lapse of time or incorrect recording, but modern history—the incidents of to-day.

For years we were in possession of the island of Cuba. The governing classes there are of the same language, of the same religion, have the same sports, and are the same in nearly everything as the governing classes in the Philippine Islands. We promised to give the Cubans a chance to try the doctrine of self-government, and they went about patiently to organize their own government, not through a congress or a commission appointed by us, but under the direction of the military arm of the United States.

They patiently awaited the pleasure of the people of the United States, and I had the great satisfaction of looking into the faces of thousands of their citizens when our beautiful flag came down and the flag of Cuba took its place. The first Cuban flag I saw raised there was at daylight, under the shadow of Morro Castle. On the deck of the steamer was a large throng, composed of Cubans, Americans, and some Cubans who had been exiled from their native land. When the flag of the single star floated from the mast I expected a cheer, but upon the happy faces of men and women, young and old, I beheld tears of joy. Strong men knelt upon the deck and sobbed as if their hearts would break for joy; and I said to myself, Where, under our flag, is there an honest American who would deny to these people the glory of self-government?

"Ah," said one old man to me in broken accents and faltering voice, "Senator, if you had taken this away from us it would not have made your country richer, and would have made us poor indeed." I saw our flag come down. It is the most beautiful and most righteous ensign in the world, and it is just as beautiful coming down as it is going up, because it was in the keeping of the promise made in this Chamber when we spoke for the conscience of 70,000,000 of God-fearing people.

But Senators exclaim that we have treaty agreements with the Philippine Islands. So we had with Cuba. Every agreement we have made in the Philippines we will keep, and the promise we ought to make now to give them a chance to try the art of self-government would still leave us in possession of the archipelago, and as we believe in peaceful possession, which will make it ten thousand times easier to keep every treaty agreement we have made with Spain.

But Senators tell us they are a mixed lot of different races and tribes, and different skins and complexions, and they tell us that the inhabitants are mere children and that we are the intelligent race, the Christian race, pressing on with civilization. Ah, Mr. President, were I to see a strong, intelligent, healthy, Christian gentleman fighting with a hungry, crippled, half-witted child in the home of the child, it would not take me long to determine who was to blame for that fight.

When impartial history, freed from racial hatred and personal prejudice, shall record the events of our war in the Philippines, the truth must then be told. Our children, who will continue to pay for our mistake, will write truthfully of it, and, I trust, forgive us, as we have forgiven the fathers who began the traffic in human slaves.

Mr. President, this mistake is not and was not a party mistake, and it is almost pitiable that it should be discussed now from a party standpoint. Republicans and Democrats alike were on the peace commission, and presented the treaty through the President for our ratification. Republicans and Democrats alike in the Senate voted for the ratification of the treaty. The distinguished gentleman, twice nominated by the Democratic party for the Presidency, came to Washington to plead with his friends, and secured votes for the ratification of that treaty.

Go out to Arlington and behold the graves, or visit St. Elizabeth and look at the insane; count the mothers who upon their knees to-night are praying for the safe return of a son in the Philippines; then drag that question down to a party basis and partisan benefit if you can. One distinguished Democratic Senator said on this floor in my hearing that the Republicans who voted for the treaty did it for the purpose of exploiting the country and adding to their wealth, and by his silence as to the motives of the Democrats who voted for it implied that their motives were more patriotic and pure than ours. I can not criticise, I can not condemn, but I have hoped and prayed that for the sake of the honor of our flag no partisan interest should obtrude itself into the sacred precincts of this discussion.



I voted for the ratification of the peace treaty. It was against my judgment, but the people of my State, without regard to party or race, desired its ratification. The legislature of my State instructed me to vote for it. I had received my office from the people against the wishes and protests of the middleman in politics. I hope I had, I think I had, high conceptions of my duty to the people; yet I never would have voted for the treaty if it had not been the open and notorious understanding that we were to have a vote upon a resolution on the same day, declaring our intention to give to the Philippines self-government as soon as, in the opinion of the people of the United States, they were equal to the task. I believed then and believe now that that promise, similar to the one we made to the Cubans, would have prevented war with the natives of the Philippine Islands. It may have been that we would have been obliged to have stayed for years in the archipelago. It may be that by common consent and for the benefit of all we would have continued in perpetual sovereignty, but our course would have been the course of peace and honor.

This is the resolution I asked for three and a half years ago in this Chamber. I introduced it, and it has been lying in the chamber house of the committee ever since.

Whereas all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Government of the United States of America will not attempt to govern the people of any other country in the world without the consent of the people themselves, or subject them by force to our dominion against their will.*

You say that I am wrong? Then if you are honest in your convictions why not try it; it will cost nothing. You have tried your plan over three years at a cost that you can not estimate. We are in possession. No harm can come from the effort, and if we fail we can change the policy in much less time than we have taken to adopt it.

Mr. President, one other great loss has been sustained by the man at our end of the chain. For more than a century this, the mother of republics, has been at liberty to speak for the smaller republics of the world. To-day we are not able to lift our voices in favor of self-government to help the struggling republics of the world. To-day in South Africa there is being waged the most cruel, useless, uncalled-for, and wicked war that history has yet recorded.

For years the life of the Republic of South Africa has been trembling in the balance, yet we have not dared to follow the illustrious example set by the fathers and offer resolutions expressing sympathy for the Republic, and even the resolution hoping for the continued life of the Republic and the speedy termination of the war in South Africa with honor to both sides is locked up in the deadhouse of our committees.

Mr. President, I wish that the man at our end of the chain was as free as he was when Webster spoke for the struggling Republic of Greece and with burning eloquence welcomed Kossuth, the Hungarian, within the walls of his capital. I wish, Mr. President, that the man at our end of the chain was as free to speak as was Blaine when, voicing the sentiment of a liberty-loving people, he welcomed among the nations of the world the newborn republics of South America. Do you dare to speak a word of sympathy for the Republic of South Africa?

The English Parliament would at once and properly respond by pointing to the Philippine Islands. The Assyrian master, pictured by Herbert Spencer, could well afford to point the finger of shame at his brother, who owned a slave, until he himself went into the slave business. And we, the proud inheritors of national liberty, can preach long and loud on the beauties of self-government, but our words must become as sounding brass and tinkling cymbal upon the ears of the nations of the world while we are governing 10,000,000 of people 7,000 miles away by force and against their will.

I make these broad statements, Mr. President—true statements which can not be denied in the face of the record here—knowing full well what it will cost to speak the truth. I will be branded by those editors and speakers who claim to have a monopoly on patriotism as a man who belittles and finds fault with his own country.

I speak the truth, and no one who disagrees with me questions that. I have arrived at the conclusion, after mature deliberation, that the best form of patriotism is to endeavor to keep our country right. If our country was at war with a great power which endangered the life of our nation, we would not even stop to consider the right or the wrong of entering into the quarrel; and even for the Philippine Islands, where I believe we could have made peace at any time in twenty-four hours by promising to the people there the same as we have promised to the people of Cuba, I have voted for every dollar asked for by the President of the United States to furnish aid, comfort, and support to our soldiers in that far-off land.

I have never had it in my heart to complain of our Army. It

is the best and bravest army in the world and under the best and most beautiful flag. It executes simply the will of the people, as expressed by Congress. It has adopted the methods of warfare which meet the necessity; and if any mistakes have been made, the responsibility is not upon the men who carry the guns, but rather upon the Senate of the United States when we purchased sovereignty from Spain and directed the Army to subjugate the people. The Senator from Wisconsin said the same men are in the island of Luzon that were in Cuba. Yes; but they are there under different orders from the people.

But Senators say that if the flag is to come down, it must come down in honor, which, standing alone, is a truism which savors of the commonplace. They say that we can not honorably consult a man as to what his future shall be while he has a gun in his hand. We dignify them by sending 50,000 men to conquer them, and with our bold statement of sovereignty over the islands, and with 50,000 guns aimed at them, we refuse to even receive their petition or hear their wishes for their own government. This is supposed to preserve our prestige and national honor.

We boast about being a world power to-day as though it were something new, whereas we have been a world power since our independence was ceded to us by Great Britain.

Some of us are tender and jealous as to what the other nations will say if we compromise with those poor, struggling people. I wish I could draw a picture for you of Gladstone after he had made the convention or treaty with South Africa, even after the great disaster of Majuba Hill. One party of English statesmen, jealous and sensitive of the prestige of the English flag, said in a memorable debate in the House of Commons that Gladstone in compromising with South Africa had dishonored his flag and lowered the prestige of the English arms; and his answer, worthy of the man who made it, settled the question, at least during the life of that statesman. He said in substance: "England is strong; England is a world power; England can with her army crush out the South African Republic; England can afford to put aside the gossip of the nations of the world who will talk about her loss of prestige; England is great enough to do right." It may not be unbecoming, Mr. President, to call attention to this historical fact, so fresh in the minds of this generation.

What Gladstone said of England is true of the United States. Our Republic is strong. We can not be blamed for boasting of our military prestige, but that alone does not represent our strength. The strength of this nation is in the honest mass of 70,000,000 people, and our Army and Navy is an expression of but one arm of our strength. We need not ask here what the world will say about the settlement of the Philippine question. Our Republic is strong enough to be independent of the opinion of the monarchies of the earth, and our Republic is righteous enough to do right, regardless of what the other nations of the world may think or say.

Gladstone said that England would seek only the happiness of the governed. Let us say that to the people of the Philippine Islands. Let us say to them by some resolution here that we intend to let them try the glorious responsibilities of self-government.

The world knows we are strong; the Filipino has felt our strength. Give them this promise, and peace will reign in the archipelago, and you will drive away anxious tears from the faces of the mothers of the Republic. Instead of loss of prestige among the nations of earth, the lovers of liberty from pole to pole will say: "See, the Mother of Republics has put aside the temptation to govern others; she believes in the doctrine she has been teaching for a hundred years—that self-government is the best. She will not try to force her religion and civilization upon others; she is going to help plant a republic that will float its colors in the very gateway of the Orient." The Philippine star and the star of Cuba would then be among the brightest that shine in the crown of our Republic.

Mr. President, I am exceedingly sorry to differ with so many of my friends in this Chamber and out. For two years I have been silent in the Senate upon this subject, hoping against hope to see the end of the war in the Philippine Islands. I have not abused those who have differed with me. I only wish and hope for the same liberty of conscience and speech for myself that I give to others. Many of you ask me in private conversation: "This is what the Anglo-Saxon has always done; it is in the blood." My answer is that the blood has improved, and that we have never before engaged in a war of conquest. We burned witches at one time, and sold slaves—the mother from her children. Who would dare to offer that now as an argument for the selling of slaves or the burning of witches? Yet our fathers did it.

We are told that some other nation might step in and govern the Philippines and that, if we cease in our attempt to govern them against their consent, England or Germany might take our place at our end of the chain. There is no danger of that, Mr. President. Those nations are not asking for a monopoly on

graves. More than that, Mr. President, since Dewey spoke in Manila Harbor, since Schley spoke at Santiago, and since the Rough Rider went up the hill at El Caney there is no nation in the world that would dare interfere with the sovereignty granted to the people of the Philippine Islands with our approval and consent or invade the smallest island in the archipelago in violation of any treaty which we have or may make with any nation in the world.

Senators may call my position impractical. I ask only in the name of justice, Why don't you try it? You have tried your plan of subduing them with a strong hand, without the promise of self-government, at the cost of a hundred thousand lives, at least, counting both sides. To try the plan I suggested will not cost one life. It was estimated by the Government that it would require 5,000 soldiers to make peace in the islands. Under your plan you have lost twice that number, and the end is not yet. It will not cost one American life nor one American dollar to point the Filipino to the flag in Cuba and promise him a chance to try it. The plan I suggest would not cost one life. For three years and a half I have asked the question in this Chamber, Why have one plan in Cuba, that brings honor and peace and makes them our friends, and another plan in the Philippines? Yet I have not had an answer.

Again I say, Mr. President, that I can not find words to express the deep personal regret I have to differ so widely with so many men in whose judgment I have great confidence and of whose patriotism I have not the shadow of a doubt. I have never had it in my heart to question either the honesty or the patriotism of my good friends who disagree with me. When but a mere boy I felt the pinch and grind of religious intolerance. I heard men in the pulpit preach that slavery was a divine institution, and that night aided my father, who was a member of the same church, in keeping an under-ground railroad station to help negroes to Canada, where they could pucker up their black lips and whistle Yankee Doodle in free Canada.

In a bird's-eye glance at the history of the world, I find the wheels of progress stopped where civil and religious freedom do not abide; but where these blessings fall men lift their eyes, and looking about them, span continents with the iron rail, chain the mighty waters and the electricity of the air to do their bidding, and open the doors of learning and make education free to all. These strides in civilization come only in self-governing countries, and self-government can be learned only by experience. Senators may call this a mere matter of sentiment; be it so. It is a sentiment based upon historical truth, and a sentiment of which no man need be ashamed. This sentiment was heard in solemn protest and through all the ages, until it finally broke forth in divine tone in the Declaration of Independence.

It was soon seen and read of all men. Monarchies trembled when facing that sentiment, and the declaration made at Philadelphia broadened everywhere constitutional government, and made for the rights of man. In the light of that declaration of self-government, patriots and statesmen for the past century have lived and died. Kossuth said that he had before him our Declaration of Independence when he wrote and fought for his native land; and Bolivar, in South America, when he laid the broad foundation of self-government for the republics there, said he was but following that sentiment just spoken in our Declaration of Independence.

Is our Government to be ruled without sentiment? Are all the great functions of government, which affect the homes of 70,000,000 people, to have nothing in its make-up but the cold, sordid thought of commercialism? Does this flag floating above us speak of nothing but trade and money? Does it stand for nothing but territorial and commercial expansion? Active, thrifty men may use it for a while, but some day a jealous people will snatch that flag from their hands and say to those who have used it for conquest: "Commerce, dollars, and trade are for the Government, not the Government for them."

There is an eagle on the banner as well as on the dollar. This flag will foster and promote all legitimate commerce for the welfare of the people; but it must not by force be set above an unhappy and unwilling people, at the cost of Government treasure and the lives of our children, to increase our trade.

Mr. President, I have faith in the ultimate judgment of the American people. This sad lesson of experience will not be without its use in the future; and if again we are tempted to govern a people without their consent, the charnel houses that come floating back from the Philippines will rise before the people for the people's good. I have faith in the ultimate liberty of all mankind. Sometimes it seems that the mills of the gods grind slow, but I have faith in the consummation of the divine plan. It may not come in your day or mine, but some day not only the people here in the mother Republic, but all over the world—in Cuba, South Africa, and the Philippine Islands—will be free, absolutely free. I can only in my own poor way contribute my feeble share

to hasten the hour when all men and all nations may walk unshackled on the footstool of God.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I wish to put into this debate three or four facts which seem to me to overthrow much of the elaborate argument of my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

At the time the orders were given to subdue that people by force Aguinaldo had under his command an army larger than General Washington ever had under his command. He had captured more guns than Washington captured during the whole of the Revolutionary war. He had behind him, allowing for all the differences the Senator mentions, men who were devoted to him, who had furnished that army, more in numbers than the whole American people, Whigs and Tories together, at the close of the Revolutionary war.

They inhabited and occupied, in peace and order and law, a territory larger than the settled parts of the United States at the close of the Revolutionary war. They had freed that whole territory from Spain. They had captured many prisoners—more than were ever captured by Washington except at Yorktown.

They had three or four thousand Spanish prisoners committed to them by us to take care of. The Spanish Chapter of the Red Cross, as I am told, decorated Aguinaldo after his recent capture with a medal in honor of the kindness of his treatment to those prisoners.

I will not detain the Senate with an elaborate answer to the elaborate argument of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. No man respects that Senator more than I do, and there are few men that I respect so highly as I respect him. I find, I am sorry to say, in his powerful speech the method of the advocate who deems it his duty to champion a side rather than that of the judge or the Senator. I do not find in it what I should have hoped, the discussion of great principles of national duty.

I do not find that he bases his argument on those simple yet profound and eternal principles which should govern the action of a great people in dealing with the fate of a people who are in its power. He has a few sneers for the Philippine republic. He finds some fault with the leaders who are striving to bring their people out of darkness into light. He thinks that in the conflict of arms that arose on that memorable night the Filipinos were the aggressors, although I believe he concedes that their leader did not desire then to bring on a conflict.

But, Mr. President, no ingenuity can conceal or obliterate the fact that there was on one side a people that had achieved its independence, that had conquered its territory, save a single city, from Spain, that had declared itself a republic, and that there was on the other side the army of a distant and alien nation under orders to subjugate them. Under such conditions how idle the inquiry, Which struck the first blow or fired the first shot? I think we fired first. The Senator from Wisconsin says they did.

My colleague, who says everything so well, has said this thing better than anybody:

There was much discussion then, and there has been much more since, as to who fired first. It was not a battle. What matters it who fired first? The first blow had been struck, the first blood shed. It said to all the world that a people intended to govern themselves and would die sooner than yield—a very pregnant fact, speaking much louder than words and charged with many meanings.

A wholly new thing this was indeed, to have a people ready to die in battle for their rights, when a large part of the rulers of the civilized world did not recognize that they had any rights to either die or live for. A great example to be deeply considered, and destined to bear much fruit.

These words were written about what happened at Lexington one April morning in 1775. But they were spoken of an event which seems to me contemporary with all the centuries and of a fruit which will grow in every soil.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin says that our troops had been attacked before the treaty was ratified. I do not so understand the history of the transaction. But for the moment let us suppose him to be right. He claims that that is inconsistent with the statement that if the treaty had been amended so as to disclaim sovereignty, or if the Bacon resolution had been adopted, there would have been no further trouble.

Mr. President, the answer to all that is easy. The treaty had been agreed upon by our commissioners; the President had sent it to the Senate with approval; it was notorious that there was a large majority for it, and that the question of its final adoption turned on one or two votes, as the adoption of the Bacon resolution turned on a single vote; and as has been said more than once, President McKinley had made a proclamation demanding submission, and saying that our authority over that people, which they denied, would be enforced, if need be, by military power.

These things were the cause of the war. These things would be taken by any spirited people to be a cause of war and a declaration of war. Now, if the treaty had been defeated, or the Bacon resolution had been adopted, that would have been an abandonment of the scheme. It would have been an abandonment of the purpose declared in President McKinley's proclamation. It would have required the reversal of the orders to subdue



that people to our authority, and would have left it only in the power of the President, or have made it only the duty of the President to restore order and then to give over the country to the people to whom it belonged.

Can there be any doubt about that in the mind of any sane man? Does anybody believe that Aguinaldo or his counselors would have encountered the power of the United States or that the hostilities would have kept on after the authentic declaration of our purpose to respect their independence and to hand over the country to them whenever orderly and peaceful government could go on?

I am told, Mr. President, as I just said, that Spain has sent out to Aguinaldo a resolution of thanks and a decoration for his humanity to her prisoners when they were in his power. That is an honor which an American soldier, however brave and brilliant, might well covet. It is an honor which Cervera and his sailors would have been very willing to pay to our naval officers who sunk their ships in the West Indies. Now, this man whom his great enemy, Spain, has so honored, I am told Governor Taft has never spoken to and that the Senate thinks it an affront to their pride to ask him to come over here and tell us his story.

Mr. President, the chapter which recorded the action of the Senate upon this question was closed nearly two years ago. The chapter which records the painful and bloody history of our war of conquest in the Philippine Islands I suppose is closing. I fear, however, that there will be other like chapters to be written before the volume is completed. Some of them may be in the distant future. I expect as the next development to see wealth, unrestrained by constitutional restrictions or by the desire for justice, undertaking to acquire the properties which belong to that people for the purpose of speculation and gain.

I believe the Administration will do what it can to curb and restrain that ambition. I know very well that the gentlemen to whom the Senate has intrusted this subject will do their best to keep the skirts of the National Government clear from all stain. I know that the power of Congress and the power of the Executive is great; but I am afraid, great as it is, it will be inadequate to curb these mighty forces from a distance and keep them within lawful and honorable bounds. This, however, is only anticipation. If I prove a false prophet, no man will be more delighted than I shall be.

The trouble with the attitude of my friends who differ from me is that they have affirmed what seems to me the most pestilential doctrine of all history, the right of one people to judge for another the question of its fitness to govern itself. No tyrant nation will ever refrain to seize upon power when it is strong enough, and no tyrant nation will ever let go its hold on a weaker people when it has got it, if your doctrine be once established.

And, Mr. President, the power of this Republic is such that it can establish the doctrine if it see fit in the permanent practice of mankind. Not all the world can maintain it against the United States or overthrow the great doctrine of human liberty. But the people of the United States, if they will, can cause the great doctrine of the liberty of nations to perish from the face of the earth, and that is the question you are attempting to decide.

What I have said about the soldiers is on the authority and testimony of soldiers. What I have said about the army is on the authority of the army. In saying it I have affirmed, what I repeat, that what has occurred has occurred as a result of the eternal law of human nature. The responsibility for it rests on us who created the conditions. It rests on the legislative and treaty-making power at home and not on the soldiers in those distant islands. If it be said that I have at any time used severe language, I answer to him who reproaches me as Antigone in the Greek play answered the tyrant:

'Tis you that say it, not I. You do the deeds,  
And your ungodly deeds find me the words.

If, in putting down a civil commotion, especially when it is caused by oppressive or tyrannical law, the authorities deal harshly or cruelly with the offender, whoever condemns the harshness and the cruelty is not rightly to be charged with an attack on the instrumentalities provided to preserve order. It is not the police, it is the unwisdom of the legislator that is responsible.

I do not charge these things upon the American soldier. I do not charge these things upon the American Army. I charge these things upon imperialism. I charge them on the greed for unjust dominion. I charge them upon the disregard of the fundamental law of the Republic.

They are the natural result of the doctrine affirmed in this Chamber and in the press, the doctrine on which the Spanish treaty was affirmed, that the Declaration of Independence is a lie, and that there is no truth in its sublime affirmation that just government rests upon the consent of the governed. When you undertook to buy sovereignty over an unwilling people from a tyrant

they had dispossessed, to take from them the liberty they had won for themselves, to treat them as the spoils of war or the booty of battle, what has happened was as sure to follow as the night to follow the day.

I have estimated the cost of this war up to the present time at \$600,000,000, and I believe that estimate not overrated. When you pay \$100,000,000 for soldiers and sailors at \$13 a month, and when you consider the cost of every transport and of subsistence, and that you are taking them from larger and more profitable employments in the peaceful avocations of life, every hundred million paid from the Treasury represents much more than another hundred million which the country loses. But at any rate you are pledged to a cost in the future which will far more than double what you have already wasted. I believe the war has already cost \$600,000,000, without including the future, in which the previous computation has been demonstrated by careful statisticians. But I will not chop logic or quibble about that.

Now, what have you had to go without? You could build with what you have spent and what you expect to spend in the near future two or three isthmian canals to the Pacific, equipped with harbors and defenses. You could have a system of national irrigation which would double the value of the great territory in the middle of the continent and cover it over with happy homes and wealthy States. You could, if you were bent on empire, get with it a navy larger than that of the two largest nations of the world, to get which would make you the foremost sea power on the face of the earth and bring the whole globe to your feet. You could endow in every one of our 45 States a university which would equal Harvard in resources. You would have money enough almost to pension the entire old age of this country, if it were an expedient thing to do; so that not only the soldiers and sailors and civil servants, but every man who had done good work for the Republic in private life could enjoy an honorable and comfortable old age. That is what this miserable doctrine of buying sovereignty for gold, that is what this miserable pride that will not talk with men with arms in their hands, has cost the American people already.

I wish to advert to but one other thing out of the many said by the Senator from Wisconsin. He attempted to meet and parry what he calls an attack on the Army by an attack on the great and sacred reputation of General Grant. He mentioned, as I understood him, that Grant did in Shenandoah Valley order to be done exactly what our generals and soldiers—some of them—have done in the Philippine Islands. He cites General Grant's orders to lay waste the Shenandoah Valley, and seeks to bring the revered figure of the mighty soldier of the civil war to the side of Hughes and Bell, to be an eternal companion in their infamy.

Let us see what General Grant did, and let us see what they did. The Shenandoah Valley was so constructed by nature in its relations to our military operations that if a force could pass through it rapidly, without impedimenta, subsisting upon the country, getting its supplies from the region, it could attack us either in front, or in flank, or in rear by means of the natural outlets which existed there. It was an avenue to attack us, and it was the granary, the storehouse for the supply of the horses and mules of the rebel army.

I am no master of military tactics, but that I understand to be the general situation. So when General Grant ordered that it should be laid waste, it is as if he were destroying a fortress or a storehouse or a place of strength of which the enemy could make direct and almost irresistible use in military operations. He did not order the homes of those people to be destroyed as a means of striking terror or of applying military coercion to their soldiers in the field. He left to private families stores enough to support them six months.

He did not assert the principle which all modern military law not only rejects, but loathes; which Abraham Lincoln's rules and the recent Hague Convention alike repudiate, that you could compel peace by making war more severe, by attacking innocent women and children or noncombatants, and destroying private property. If General Grant had believed in that doctrine, he would have applied it to the whole South alike. There was no reason of confining it to the Shenandoah Valley. The Shenandoah Valley was not a tenth part as rebel in sentiment as other parts of the South. Our Government applied no such doctrine to Louisiana when we got her into our power, or to South Carolina, or Missouri.

Now, contrast with that what was done in the Philippine Islands. We did not order the population of whole districts into reconcentrado camps when we got possession of them in order that we might terrify and coerce male relatives of the people who were in the field. We did not destroy towns and villages for the mere purpose of striking terror into that people, or if we ever did it it is a blot on our escutcheon. On the other hand, what did they do

in the Philippine Islands? General Bell, in his order of December 9, 1901, a few days only before Governor Taft started for this country, says:

To all station commanders:

A general conviction, which the brigade commander shares, appears to exist that the insurrection in this brigade continues because the greater part of the people, especially the wealthy ones, pretend to desire but in reality do not want peace.

He is not speaking there of soldiers, of course. He is speaking of the people—those who pretend to want peace.

That when all really want peace we can have it promptly. Under such circumstances it is clearly indicated that a policy should be adopted that will as soon as possible make the people want peace, and want it badly.

He is not talking about soldiers. He is not talking about armed people. He is talking about people at home who are pretending to be peaceable and pretending to want peace, and he proposes that what is prescribed in this order shall be perpetrated, not against soldiers, but against the populace.

I have extracted from the record the testimony of General Hughes, who shows he is not talking about soldiers. He is talking about people at home living in peace and quiet, whom he orders to be destroyed to make the Filipino people, to use his phrase, want peace and want it badly. When he is asked, when he burned a village, what had become of the population—the women and the children—he said, "That is their lookout." And when a member of the committee asked him, Is that civilized warfare? General Hughes said that it is not civilized warfare.

Now, you say we are attacking the Army when we stand up here and say that this is not civilized warfare, when the very men whom we are criticising declare that they had abandoned it.

Senators talk about the Filipinos firing on flags of truce. In November, 1899, you have in the record which I will put in with my remarks a report of a general who said 300 people came along the railroad waving a flag of truce, and then as he was preparing to fire on them our cavalry fired on them from the right and on the left and they were dispersed. The firing on flags of truce was begun by us according to the reports of the War Department.

Did General Grant, by the means of coercion, order war to be made by attacking innocent women and children and putting to death all boys over 10 years old? Mr. President, the most shameful single thing in this whole transaction is the summoning the authority of General Grant to justify the order of General Hughes. If General Grant had done this thing he would have gone into history as a monster.

"Senator RAWLINS. Is it not true that operations in the islands became progressively more severe within the past year and a half in dealing with districts which were disturbed?"

"General HUGHES. I think that is true. I would not say it is entirely so. The severities depend upon the man immediately in command of the force that he has with him. In the department I suppose I had at times as many as a hundred and twenty commands in the field. Each commander, under general restrictions, had authority to act for himself."

In other words he had authority to burn or not to burn, as he might see proper, in his own judgment, and, consequently, as some thought proper to burn a little more freely than others, the rule and practice, according to what he said, varied. He goes on to say:

"These commanders were changed from time to time. The new commanders coming in would probably start in very much easier than the old ones."

In other words, they would not burn the houses quite as much as the old ones. They had not got to be so callous. They had not got to be so absolutely indifferent to all rules of civilized warfare, and consequently they were easier, as General Hughes says:

"These commanders were changed from time to time. The new commanders coming in would probably start in very much easier than the old ones."

"Senator HALE. Very much what?"

"General HUGHES. Easier. They would come from this country with their ideas of civilized warfare, and they were allowed to get their lesson."

Now, take General Hughes's testimony in the hearings before the Philippine Committee:

Mr. President, what is General Hughes's testimony on that line? It is found on page 558 of the hearings before the Philippine Committee. The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] asked this question:

"In this connection, in burning towns, what would you do? Would the entire town be destroyed by fire, or would only offending portions of the town be burned?"

"General HUGHES. I do not know that we ever had a case of burning what you would call a town in this country, but probably a barrio or a sitio; probably a half a dozen houses, native shacks, where the insurgents would go in and be concealed, and if they caught a detachment passing they would kill some of them."

"Senator RAWLINS. What did I understand you to say would be the consequences of that?"

"General HUGHES. They usually burned the village."

"Senator RAWLINS. All of the houses in the village?"

"General HUGHES. Yes; every one of them."

"Senator RAWLINS. What would become of the inhabitants?"

"General HUGHES. That was their lookout."

Then continuing the examination:

"Senator RAWLINS. If these shacks were of no consequence, what was the utility of their destruction?"

"General HUGHES. The destruction was as a punishment."

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator give me the page?

Mr. BACON. Page 553. I had already announced it.

Mr. SPOONER. I did not hear it.

Mr. BACON. It continues:

"General HUGHES. The destruction was as a punishment. They permitted

these people to come in there and conceal themselves, and they gave no sign. It is always

"Senator RAWLINS. The punishment in that case would fall not upon the men, who could go elsewhere, but mainly upon the women and little children. "General HUGHES. The women and children are a part of the family, and where you wish to inflict a punishment you can punish the man probably worse in that way than in any other."

"Senator RAWLINS. But is that within the ordinary rules of civilized warfare? Of course, you could exterminate the family, which would be still worse punishment."

"General HUGHES. These people are not civilized."

"Senator RAWLINS. Then I understand you to say it is not civilized warfare?"

"General HUGHES. No; I think it is not."

"Senator RAWLINS. You think it is not?"

"Senator DIETRICH. In order to carry on civilized warfare both sides have to engage in such warfare."

"General HUGHES. Yes, sir; certainly. That is the point."

"I think, if I am allowed to go on, I will come to a place where I shall have something to say that will bear directly on this subject."

CONDUCT OF THE WAR BECOMES STERNER.

"Senator HALE. You made a very interesting statement some time ago that from year to year, or from summer to summer, the conduct of the war was sterner, stiffer, as you called it. You are describing what took place the second summer, not the first?"

"General HUGHES. Yes."

General Hughes adds:

In the first campaign the rules of civilized warfare were rigidly enforced. But the next year we found it necessary to adopt more stringent methods in order to reach these people.

That means that we have abandoned the rules of civilized warfare.

Now, what does this all come to? Undoubtedly you have disarmed that people with your superior forces and your water torture. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] says we have reduced our Army from 70,000 to 25,000 or 27,000, I think, and shall reduce it by a few thousand more in the near future. It may be that we have. But you have reduced the Army because you have disarmed the people and not because you have changed their minds.

He says, too, we have got three or four hundred American teachers there and have got 4,000 Filipino teachers there. You would have had, in my opinion, a good many more American teachers there to-day, doing a great deal better work, if you had pursued the Cuban policy instead of your Asiatic policy. Would you not? How many American teachers, how many Cuban teachers are there in Cuba to-day? You have made, in my opinion, on this testimony no advance in any conquest of the hearts of that people. There were in Cuba for the million and a half of people nearly 3,500 teachers.

I submit an article from the Manila Freedom, published just about the time Governor Taft came over, in which the editor says that there is no respectable paper in the Philippine Islands supporting the policy of the Philippine Commission, and that the spirit of insurrection, though subdued, is as strong as ever in the hearts of that people.

[The Manila Freedom, Edward F. O'Brien, editor.]

WEDNESDAY, December 18, 1901.

#### EDITORIAL.

Nothing can be accomplished in the Philippines until force has defeated, permanently, the enemy. It is useless to fool ourselves. We have tried civil government; we have placed prominent Filipinos in high places; we have prated of Americanism and progress, and with what result? Batangas, Samar, Tayabas, Laguna—and the list might be extended to cover the entire archipelago—all show the results. There is as much insurrection fomenting here as there was three years ago, and there will be as much three years from now.

There is only one remedy. The military must be supreme—must be given absolute control of the situation. There must be an army of at least 75,000 men here, and the desired end will be accomplished sooner with 100,000. The Filipinos must be defeated, absolutely and unconditionally defeated. They must be swept aside, at no matter what cost. Reconcentration—the same reconcentration which we deplored in Cuba—must be used. Those who evidence a desire to be peaceful must be gathered in camps or towns and protected by American troops.

America, unlike Spain and Cuba, must furnish, if necessary, to these people the means of life when their supplies run out. In return they must be made to assist in the erection of trenches and military works. All sources of livelihood must be cut off from the enemy in the field. The Navy must furnish sufficient vessels to patrol the islands and prevent filibustering, for we are blind when we deny that the enemy is receiving encouragement from the exterior.

Americans must occupy the positions of responsibility. There are places for but few Filipinos in the government until all armed resistance is put down, once for all.

The results of a policy of this sort must be severe. Thousands of lives will pay the forfeit, but it is the only way to accomplish the desired end. The captures or death of Lukban and Malvar will not end the insurrection, no more than the capture of a hundred others has not it. For every leader who falls there are a dozen ready to fill his shoes.

The time has come when the matter must be viewed from the front. We have fooled ourselves, and we have made ourselves the dupes of those whom we have trusted. The money we pay, supposedly for peace, is going to strengthen insurrection. It is time to admit that we have made a grand mistake, and undo the skein we have tangled. We must go back to the cross roads and take the other path.

They tell us that capital will conquer the islands. But when is capital coming? Will it come when it is as much as life itself is worth to go through the islands without a bodyguard? The answer is "No." Capital will come to these islands only when peace reigns, and according to our present procedure we will never have peace.



We are only fostering a spirit which will eventually defeat us. This may not come about through force of arms, but it is bound to come about through the taxpayers of the United States, who will refuse to sanction an unending and eminently costly warfare.

Let us have peace, and as a sure means to peace let us have warfare unconditional, and warfare in the sense in which warfare is really meant.

Now, you have on the other hand Governor Taft's dreams, of which he declares himself very uncertain of doing something in one or two generations, or perhaps a century. The Senator from Michigan, as I said just now, takes comfort in the fact that we have reduced our forces to 25,000 or 27,000 men. But you thought when you started that you could get along with 7,000 men. You have had more than 125,000 there since, if I do not mistake. You have not dared to arm, equip, discipline, or organize a single Filipino regiment.

That is a test better than any other of whether you really have a people there who love you and will stand by you. If they are on your side, their armed and disciplined soldiery will be on your side, as the soldiery of Canada are ready to fight for England. If the youth are brought up to love you, they will enlist for you and fight for you and die for you, and you can trust them. Now, when I asked that question my friends of the majority of the committee answered me by talking about policemen and Macabean scouts, the old instruments of the cruel tyranny of Spain.

Mr. President, I do not deny that you will get peace pretty soon. It has nearly come already, and of course for us peace is better than conflict, but the question is, What are you doing to benefit the Philippine people? There are some things better for a people than voluntary and abject submission to foreign rule. The permanent loss of liberty is worse for a people than war. It is worse for a people than disaster. It is worse even than anarchy.

The great fundamental question in all this business is whether one man has a right to decide this question for another—whether one nation or people have a right to decide it for another. Now, there is a good deal involved in that. This great doctrine of the consent of the governed has been the beacon light of humanity for more than a hundred years. All over the world the eyes of men in darkness have seen that great light, sometimes even when they knew not from whence it came.

The peasant in the Siberian waste, the patriot in his dungeon, the serf in his hovel have looked to it as the one thing that gave manhood dignity or even made life itself tolerable. Whenever a people strove for liberty against tyranny their champions have looked to the United States and have read the great Declaration. Kossuth came here from Hungary; O'Connell looked to us across the sea from Ireland; Garibaldi, whose bust his grateful countrymen gave to the Senate of the United States and which stands in yonder beautiful gallery, looked with longing eyes for our sympathy and encouragement.

The Swiss on his chainless mountains, France, after many bloody struggles, looked to us for this gospel of glad tidings. And now are all mankind to learn that the great people who proclaimed this evangel of liberty have themselves disowned it, that trade and gain, that franchises and nuggets of gold, and the dreams of empire have taken its place in our vision, too.

Nowhere on the face of the earth is the doctrine hereafter to be believed that men or that nations are created equal in political rights, or that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, if the United States have abandoned it. The torch of Liberty enlightening the world is in the hand of the American people to-day. You may keep it blazing aloft, or you may invert it and plunge it into this lake of mire.

Mr. President, the objection to this bill is not in what it does, but in what it claims the right to do. Other Senators will do their duty as they see it. I shall do mine as God gives me to see it.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator's time has expired.

**Mr. STEWART.** Mr. President, the contention in this discussion that all government rests upon the consent of the governed can not be maintained. It ignores the irrepressible conflict between civilization and barbarism. While I do not wish to compare the aborigines of this country with the natives of the Philippines, still it must be admitted that the numerous tribes of Indians who once occupied all of the territory now inhabited by the people of the United States were as much devoted to their independence and had as ardent a desire for liberty as any people who ever lived. If our forefathers had acted upon the theory of distinguished Senators that they could acquire no right to establish government in the land of the aborigines without the latter's consent, North America would to-day be the home of barbarism and not of civilization.

At the time the Declaration of Independence was written there were numerous tribes of Indians in the territory which it embraced living under governments established by themselves and claiming independence against all the world. There were also numerous slaves in this country. How absurd it would have

been to consult either the Indians or the slaves in order to obtain their consent to the new government established by the fathers. There can be no doubt that the Declaration of Independence included the white citizens of the colonies who had banded together to set up an independent government of their own. It referred only to those people who were to govern as well as to be governed. It did not refer to any inhabitants of the country who were incapable at the time by nature or by education to participate in the government of the country. The contemporaneous construction of the language of the Declaration of Independence excludes the presumption that the consent of those who would not or could not participate in the proposed government was required.

Both the majority and the minority agree in their reports that it is the duty of the United States to establish a stable form of government in the Philippines. How long it will take to perform that duty no one can now predict. It is certainly necessary to supersede as rapidly as possible the present military establishment by a civil form of government. The bill under consideration is intended to inaugurate civil in place of the military government. To this there can be no objection from any quarter, for it is the plan proposed by both the majority and the minority.

When the treaty with Spain was negotiated we did not know that the obligations to maintain law and order and protect life and property in the Philippines which the United States assumed would be resisted. It was not known that the war which would follow the discharge of our obligations to Spain and to the civilized world would be of the same barbarous character as our war with the Indian tribes from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Having destroyed the despotic rule of Spain against which the Filipinos had protested and fought for three hundred years, we naturally supposed that the natives whom we had delivered from Spanish misrule would at least be friendly.

The minority, deriving their facts from disgruntled citizens at home and the motley crowd of renegade Filipinos and other revilers of the United States abroad, contend that the people of the islands we acquired from Spain were friendly to the United States and willing to cooperate with this Government in maintaining all the obligations assumed in the treaty with Spain. The majority, who rely on the testimony of our gallant generals, our brave soldiers, our commissioners, and other agents of the highest character, are forced to the conclusion that Aguinaldo and his oligarchy treacherously betrayed the confidence of this country and inaugurated a war marked by all the evidences of barbarity, hypocrisy, villainy, and cruelty which characterized the murderous Apaches in their warfare against the United States.

When we reflect that the war with Spain was more especially the work of Democrats than of Republicans, that the treaty was ratified by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States, that appropriations have been unanimously made from time to time whenever necessary to maintain the authority of the United States in the islands acquired by purchase and by war, and that our gallant and devoted Army, recruited alike from Democrats and Republicans, has made unparalleled sacrifices in its conflict with a barbarous and treacherous foe in tropical islands 8,000 miles away, we are astonished that any voice can be heard in the United States to defend the right of Aguinaldo and his coconspirators to rob, plunder, and oppress the very people the United States is solemnly bound to protect. It is still more remarkable that anybody in the United States should be found to take sides with the highwaymen and guerrillas of the Philippines against the citizens and soldiers of the United States engaged in the humane and philanthropic undertaking of conferring the blessings of liberty, law, and good government upon the people of the archipelago.

The excuse of the minority for arraigning the Administration and the Army is an unfortunate one. The minority inform us that they, too, are desirous of establishing and maintaining a stable government in the Philippines until full guaranties can be given by such government that it will carry out all the obligations that the United States incurred by the treaty with Spain, and that it will also protect all the inhabitants of those islands and carry out its treaty obligations with all the world. But the minority say that when all this shall have been accomplished, and not till then, the United States should acknowledge the independence of the government of the islands and invite all the great powers of the earth to assist this Government in maintaining a protectorate over the government established in the Philippines.

The minority contend that although the time required to accomplish this great work can not now be ascertained, yet it is the duty of the United States to promise the guerrillas in arms their independence when a stable government giving the required guaranties has been established. To prove the necessity for such a promise a vast amount of testimony has been collected and spread before the country. Flaming speeches of the most sanguinary, if not the most vituperative, character in the history of

the Senate have been made to show that the Administration, the Army, and the civilians engaged in the work of establishing a government in the Philippines have been guilty of all sorts of misdoings, both of omission and commission. It has been contended that it is the duty of the Government to tell the Filipinos that whether they are good or bad they shall have their independence, not on account of any merit they possess, but solely on the demerits of the people of the United States.

We did not need the minority's elaborate illustration of the unkind things that may be said by malcontents at home or enemies abroad. We knew from the beginning that among the vast number of good citizens that free institutions have produced in the United States there is a rare sprinkling of very egotistical, very selfish, and very uncharitable people, who, in the name of goodness, will take the side of the wicked every time. They can not believe that there is any good in the Administration, in the Army, or in the masses at large which they themselves do not monopolize.

Is it any good reason why this bill should not be passed because the majority are unwilling to make promises to be performed in the distant future, the conditions of which can not be known in this generation? Is it any good reason why this bill should not be passed for the establishment of civil government—which both the minority and the majority agree ought to be done—because a very few malcontents in the United States have faith in anything and everything favorable to the enemy and disbelieve everything favorable to the Administration, the Army, or even the Government of the United States, under whose protection they live and prosper?

No man deprecates acts of cruelty on the part of the Army of the United States, even under the most trying circumstances, more than I do; but I protest against the trial of our gallant soldiers, fighting for the flag 8,000 miles away, on ex parte testimony or on stories emanating in the imagination of either the disappointed or the disgruntled elements of society. Even the minority admits that we can not honorably withdraw from the islands until there has been a government established capable of giving guaranties to us, to Spain, and to all the world to protect the lives and property of all the people of the islands, native born and foreign, and to fulfill all international obligations.

Is it fair, while all the resources of the United States, composed of men, money, and statesmanship, are devoted to carrying out the national obligations which have been incurred by both parties alike, to use arguments and publish matter to bring this country into contempt, to engender hatred among the natives of the islands for whom our people are making unparalleled sacrifices to rescue from barbarism and to secure for them the blessings of civil liberty?

There can be no question that our Democratic brethren have made a mistake in allowing the issue between them and the majority apparently to involve the honor of the country, the Administration, and the Army.

The Senators on the other side appear to realize that they are in a false position, and regard themselves as called upon to disclaim any opposition to the Army and protest that they are the true friends of the soldiers. It is unfortunate that their position in this debate has placed them apparently in opposition not only to the Army but to the Government of the United States.

No one doubts the loyalty of those Senators to their country or their pride in the achievements of our soldiers, but it is unfortunate for them that by accident or otherwise they have fallen into a false position. If they do not realize it now, they certainly will when the whole case is summed up before the people in the next campaign. The country will indorse the Administration and the Army in executing the obligations assumed by the Government and every department thereof in maintaining law and order in the archipelago.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to ask what amendment is now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], as the Chair understands.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope we can have a vote on that amendment.

Mr. TELLER. Under our agreement we can not have a vote on anything until 4 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the agreement may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). The Chair understands that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] was submitted as an amendment which he intended to propose, and was printed. The Chair does not understand that he has yet offered it.

Mr. TELLER. I have offered it to-day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not aware of that fact.

Mr. TELLER. No; the present occupant of the chair was not in the chair at the time I offered the amendment. It is now pending. It is to strike out section 5 and insert the amendment,

which is a modification of the language contained in the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] calls for the reading of the amendment.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that it be read.

Mr. ALLISON. I did not ask for that; but I do not object to its being read.

Mr. TELLER. The amendment has been read.

Mr. BATE. I think, if there is any doubt about the agreement which has been arrived at, the matter had better be determined now, because other amendments will come in and other questions will arise.

Mr. TELLER. Let us have the agreement read. I do not understand that we can vote on the amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement as it appears on the Calendar will be read.

Mr. ALLISON. Before it is read, I desire to say a word. I did not understand what has been stated by the Senator from Colorado to be the purport of the agreement. We have agreed to ten or fifteen amendments this morning.

Mr. TELLER. But those were acted upon by unanimous consent, as I understand.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think so. I mean to say that I did not so understand it. I understand the agreement to be that on whatever amendments may be pending at 4 o'clock to-morrow the vote shall be taken, and afterwards that a vote shall be taken upon the bill. I agree, of course, that we can not take a vote on the bill until 4 o'clock to-morrow, but I do not understand that the agreement precludes voting on amendments during these two days of fifteen-minute debate.

Mr. TELLER. Let the agreement be read.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement as it appears in the Calendar will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that the Senate shall meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Thursday and Saturday of this week and on Monday and Tuesday of next week; that general debate on S. 228, "A bill temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," shall close on Saturday; that on Monday and Tuesday debate shall be limited to fifteen minutes, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, without further debate, the Senate shall proceed to vote on all pending amendments, and amendments to be offered, and then on the bill. This agreement is not to interfere with reports of committees of conference.

Mr. TELLER. I should like the construction of the Chair on that agreement. I am not particular about it, only I should like to know what the Chair's construction of it is.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Chair construes it, I wish to say that I understood the object of the fifteen-minute debate was to give Senators an opportunity to explain amendments offered, and to hear objections thereto.

Mr. TELLER. I thought so.

Mr. ALLISON. It was with that view that the time for a short debate on amendments was proposed, and I think the reasonable construction is that which I suggest; but of course I yield to the construction of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing specified in the agreement as to when votes shall be taken upon the amendments. Certainly the Chair can find nothing to that effect.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] was in the chair at the time the agreement was made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I chanced to be in the chair at the time, and I think the statement was, as it appears on the Calendar, "that at 4 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, without further debate, the Senate shall proceed to vote on all pending amendments and amendments to be offered, and then on the bill."

Mr. BERRY. Amendments pending at that time.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; on pending amendments and amendments to be offered.

Mr. TELLER. And all amendments that might be offered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; and it was the distinct understanding that amendments might be offered in addition to the amendments pending.

Mr. TELLER. There was certainly no purpose to cut off amendments after we begin to vote.

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to mean that all amendments are to be left pending until 4 o'clock on Tuesday?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I would say, I think not. I think the understanding was that the Senate would proceed to vote on amendments pending at 4 o'clock, and that other amendments could then be offered.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not mean that, but I mean as to the action



on amendments in the meantime. That is the question the Senate is now considering.

Mr. COCKRELL. We are to vote on amendments then pending and on the amendments to be offered.

Mr. GALLINGER. And on amendments to be offered.

Mr. BERRY. We are talking about whether we can now vote upon amendments.

Mr. TELLER. The question is whether we can vote on amendments now.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has offered an amendment, and I ask that we take a vote on that now, unless some Senator wants to speak on it.

Mr. BATE. If we should do that we would be doing an injustice to a great many Senators who are not here now, because I think Senators understood there would be no vote taken on any amendment until 4 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this morning the chairman of the Committee on the Philippines presented many amendments, which were acted upon this morning.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to add, Mr. President, that, as I understood the matter, having happened to be in the chair at that time the agreement was made, there was nothing suggested that would preclude voting upon amendments prior to the hour of 4 o'clock to-morrow, as was done this morning. I do not think, unless there is an objection to voting upon an amendment, that it would be out of order to vote upon any amendment prior to 4 o'clock on Tuesday. However, that would be for the Senate to decide.

Mr. COCKRELL. The amendments this morning were committee amendments and were not controverted amendments which were to be discussed and decided upon by a yea-and-nay vote or anything of that kind. I suppose, as a matter of course, the committee having the bill in charge have a right to amend it at any time with amendments that do not change the bill materially and about which there is no controversy.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I meant to say—amendments not controverted.

Mr. TELLER. It is quite immaterial to me whether or not we vote upon the amendments now, except that I think this matter ought to be understood by the Senate, so that Senators will not be absent who might want to be here when the vote is taken.

I offered an amendment to strike out section 5 and insert an amendment which, I think, exactly carries out the idea of the committee, except where the committee say that the Filipinos shall be "citizens of the Philippine Islands." I insert that they shall be "citizens of the government of the Philippine Islands." I am not myself able to conceive that they can be citizens of an island. There must be a sovereignty, as I understand it, and for that reason I have offered the amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if no one is prepared to go on with the discussion of the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent that it be laid aside for thirty minutes.

Mr. TELLER. I think we had better not do that. A number of Senators have gone out to lunch who will probably return in a few moments, and meantime, as I want to say a few words, I may as well say them now.

Mr. GALLINGER. I noticed there was a lull in the discussion, and that is the reason I made the suggestion.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not regard section 5 as a matter of any great importance, because it seems to me that it really does nothing. When you say that the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are "citizens of the Philippine Islands," that conveys no information to me, for I can not conceive of their being citizens of an island that has not sovereignty. I propose to amend that by saying that they shall be "citizens of the government of the Philippine Islands." I do not know what would be the effect of the committee's provision. The committee provides that the Filipinos are "entitled to the protection of the United States," while my amendment provides that they shall be "entitled to the protection of the United States and all the rights and privileges of the bill of rights as enumerated in section 2 of this act."

Mr. President, that is a matter of no very great consequence. I want to say a word or two, however, about this debate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] who has just taken his seat followed the regular course of his associates on the other side of the Chamber, which seems to be to divert the whole question from one of consequence to one of inconsequence, or one of comparatively no consequence. It is not a question we are considering here now, whether the American Army has within its confines some cruel or wicked men, nor is it a question whether the American Army is being somewhat brought into discredit by the misconduct of some of its members and some of its officers. Those are not the questions which we ought to consider, though we are considering them. The question we ought first to consider is as to whether it is a proper thing for us to govern those islands in the

way we are now governing them, or whether they ought to be governed in a different manner.

Mr. President, I wish to read a word or two from what the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said in the Senate before the treaty was ratified, January 24, 1899:

I believe we can be trusted as a people to deal honestly and justly with the islands and their inhabitants thus given to our care. What our precise policy shall be I do not know, because I for one am not sufficiently informed as to the conditions there to be able to say what it will be best to do, nor, I may add, do I think anyone is.

I think that was a correct statement.

But I believe that we shall have the wisdom not to attempt to incorporate those islands with our body politic or make their inhabitants part of our citizenship or set their labor alongside of ours and within our tariff to compete in any industry with American workmen.

I skip some, because I do not desire to consume all my time in reading.

I believe that we shall have the wisdom, the self-restraint, and the ability to restore peace and order in those islands and give to their people an opportunity for self-government and for freedom under the protecting shield of the United States until the time shall come when they are able to stand alone, if such a thing be possible, and if they do not themselves desire to remain under our protection.

Skipping again:

During the campaign of last autumn I said in many speeches to the people of my State that I could never assent to hand those islands back to Spain; that I wanted no subject races and no vassal states, but that we had by the fortunes of war assumed a great responsibility in the Philippines; that we ought to meet it, and that we ought to give to those people an opportunity for freedom, for peace, and for self-government; that we ought to protect them from the rapacity of other nations and seek to uplift those whom we had freed. From those views I have never swerved, and I believed then, as I believe now, that they met with the approbation of an overwhelming majority of the people of Massachusetts. I believe those results can and will be obtained. I can not forecast the future, as so many others have been able to do. I can but proceed step by step, and the only step I can see now to take is to ratify the treaty, for in that way alone can we take the islands from Spain and give ourselves opportunity to deal with them and bring peace and freedom to their inhabitants.

Again, he says:

The treaty commits the disposition of the Philippine Islands to Congress and to the ways and practices of peace.

I believe that was practically the opinion of the majority of the Senators at least who voted for the treaty. I read this because the Senator in that statement expressed the idea which I had expressed, not so finely as he did, but as positively as I could on that question.

It does not seem to me as if it were worth while now to spend very much time over the question whether we had the power to take the islands. On that I myself have never had any question. We have as much right to take territory by conquest of war or by purchase as any other nation in the world. I have so contended and still contend. I said in the fall of 1898 that it was a question simply of what we would do with the islands when we had them; that we were not going to give them to Spain; that we were not going to trade them off to any other country; that we were not going to withdraw from them and say that the task was too big for us; but that we were going to endeavor, I stated, as the Senator from Massachusetts did, to establish a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

I said in express terms that our flag would stay there until we put up something better; that it could not come down until we put up something better, just as happened in Cuba the other day. We put up a flag for the Cubans. They could not have put it up without our help. We had to drive out Spain. Of course you may say they put it up. I noticed what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MASON] said about the putting up of the Cuban flag. A gentleman called on me yesterday, who was present and saw the flag put up, and he said there were thousands and thousands of people in the city of Habana, and when our flag came down and the Cuban flag went up, he had expected to hear a great shout, but on the contrary the people were quiet, subdued, and thousands of them were in tears. That flag went up not amid the cheers of an unthinking crowd, but it went up amidst the tears of men who had fought to see it put up, of men who had sacrificed everything except life to see it go up.

So we said when this treaty was ratified here, "Our flag is there; we are going to keep it there until we put up something better," which will be the Filipino flag when it is put up.

Mr. President, I feel inclined to complain somewhat of the attempt to put upon us the charge that we have been traducing and slandering the Army. I say nothing of the kind has been done. The Republican Senators during this debate have constituted themselves the special champions of the Army, as it appears. They have gone into heroics over the honor of the Army and inveighed against the wickedness of those who complain not of the Army but of the individual misconduct of officers and soldiers. They have not of late denied that there has been gross violation of the rules of warfare recognized among the Christian nations of the world.

Some of the Army officers have declared that the Filipinos are

not conducting the war according to the rules of civilized warfare, and that that justifies our soldiers in disregarding such rules. I have not heard any Senator assert that such is the law, and I do not suppose I shall hear any Senator assert it. No one can defend an atrocity or violation of the recognized rules of warfare by such an excuse. I am glad that excuse is confined to a very limited number outside of the Senate.

Have the opponents of the present conduct of the war abused the Army? Have those who complain that it has not been properly conducted abused the Army? Have the opponents gone beyond what is right? They certainly have not abused the Army unless they have brought false accusations against the Army or against members of it. Have we done that? I say without hesitation we have not.

We have said that at times, and in places that we have stated, the laws of civilized warfare have been disregarded, and we have called for a reform in these cases.

Is it not admitted by the Administration that these charges are true? It is also true that Republican Senators and Republican newspapers throughout the land condemn such acts, and they have not found defenders anywhere except by a few men in the Army. The great body of the officers and soldiers repudiate and condemn such acts as heartily as we do.

Where do these charges primarily come from? Who makes them? I think it is safe to say 90 per cent of them come from soldiers in the field or returned soldiers just from the field. They have all appeared in the public press of the country, not by the procurement of Democratic Senators, but by the action of the soldiers themselves or their families and friends. The other 10 per cent can be found in the official reports of Army officers or civil governors who in many cases are also Army officers.

It is said that in some instances these violations of the laws of war are to be attributed to the cruelties inflicted on our soldiers or on the inhabitants friendly to us. These facts may be considered as palliative or extenuating, but not as a defense. Such circumstances may be properly considered as mitigating the offense. But many of these authenticated cases do not admit even of such palliation, for there was no such inciting cause; on the contrary, some of the cases complained of could not have been caused by the especial misconduct of the Filipinos or by the general conduct of the war on their part.

Is it inconsistent with proper respect for the Army for those who know or have reason to suppose such violations of the rules of war are taking place to denounce them or to call the attention of Congress to them?

I do not mean to charge that any member of this body has any degree of sympathy with such acts, or any violation of the rules of warfare, but in the very nature of things the Republican Senators will hesitate to bring to the attention of Congress those things that may be used to condemn the policy of the party in respect to these islands.

We do know that notwithstanding their disapproval and condemnation of such acts they have refused to admit their existence until the proof compelled such admission. I can understand how a party believing that their policy is just and wise will satisfy their consciences by the hope that such cases are merely sporadic and do not represent any considerable sentiment in the Army, and that for them at least there may be some mitigating circumstances.

But is it fair, is it just, to say that those who demand that if such crimes have been committed they shall cease and the authors shall be punished are moved by partisan feelings only and a desire to discredit a branch of the public service?

If the newspapers of the country of all kinds publish these charges, giving them great publicity; if official reports contain such charges, as they certainly do to some extent, why is it that those who declare they do not approve such violation of the laws of war denounce in unmeasured terms those who but at most reiterate them, and in most cases have not gone beyond asking that the reports may be considered by the proper authorities for the purpose of punishing the offenders if true and showing their falsity if false.

Is it not to secure to their political party the advantages that may be secured by discrediting the reports in the first instance, and if that is not possible, making it appear that the parties complaining are moved only by hostility to the Army? With courts-martial finding facts that are so atrocious as to meet the condemnation of the best of our military officers and the condemnation of the President of the United States, with courts-martial yet to be held to determine the truth of these charges, it would seem to the ordinary citizen that enough has been proved and is likely to be proved to justify all efforts that have been made to have the war conducted as becomes a civilized and Christian nation.

A Senator has said on the floor of the Senate:

I stand for the army of McKinley, the army that is supported in its mission by the American people at the polls.

What is the mission of the Army? No man knows what it is and no man has dared to declare what its mission is. When will the party in power declare its mission? What is meant by the army of McKinley? Is the American Army the Army of the President? Is it not subject to the laws of the country? Is it not open to criticism if deserving of criticism? Is the question how the war shall be conducted a question for the Army or for Congress?

Is it the honor of the Army that is involved, or is it the honor of the nation? It seems to me that our national honor is involved in this matter, and the nation's acts must be determined by national authority, and that is the Congress of the United States.

Why complain that the Democratic Senators insist that cruelties have been practiced by soldiers in our Army and that they must be discontinued?

A large number of influential and devoted Republicans all over the land are making the same charges that are complained of, and are insisting that the war as carried on is a disgrace to the nation.

A large number of influential divines of every denomination of the Christian religion are making the same complaint.

A great number of Republican newspapers are reiterating the charges. Public meetings are held, not of Democrats, but composed of men of all political parties and of all religious thought, demanding that there must be a change in the conduct of the war.

Why do Senators on the other side of the Chamber waste their time in charging that all of the suggestions made here which have appeared in the public prints and in official reports are simply presented in order to discredit the Army?

Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion as to inconsistency. I observe, however, by the indications on the part of the Chair, that I have about used up my fifteen minutes, and therefore I will withhold what I was about to say in addition.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Colorado can go on if no one else desires to proceed.

Mr. TELLER. I hardly think I ought to do so. Some one else may wish to speak. I will take occasion on some other amendment to submit what I have to say.

Mr. BACON addressed the Senate. After having spoken thirteen minutes, he said:

Mr. President, I do not know how much of my time I have consumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Senator from Georgia has two or three minutes left.

Mr. BACON. I was about to say that I have another authority which I wish to read, but I do not want to start on it unless I have the opportunity to complete it, and I could not do so in that time. I have something else to say in connection with it. I will have plenty of opportunity to do so hereafter, and therefore I will suspend for the present.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 31st ultimo approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Edmunds;

An act (S. 1464) to establish storm-warning stations at South Manitou Island, Lake Michigan;

An act (S. 3129) for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

An act (S. 3666) to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

An act (S. 3848) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.;

An act (S. 3908) granting homesteaders on the abandoned Fort Bridger, Fort Sanders, and Fort Laramie military reservations, and Fort Laramie wood reservation, in Wyoming, the right to purchase one quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing land, and for other purposes; and

An act (S. 4264) providing that the statute of limitations of the several States shall apply as a defense to actions brought in the United States courts for the recovery of lands patented in severally to members of any tribe of Indians under any treaty between it and the United States of America.

#### PAY OF THE NAVY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, a statement prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Navy of all expenditures under the head of "Pay of the Navy" in the naval appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1902, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.



## GARFIELD HOSPITAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an estimate of appropriation for equipping Garfield Hospital with appliances for escape and protection from fires in the sum of \$3,000; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, certain information relative to quarters rented by the Navy Department, giving the location, area of floor space occupied, and the annual rental thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

## CHARLESTON (S. C.) NAVY-YARD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 27th ultimo, estimates covering such public works as can either be erected or started during the next fiscal year at the navy-yard at Charleston, S. C.; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

## LAWS OF PORTO RICO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Journal of the Executive Council of Porto Rico, Second Legislative Assembly, and the Minutes of the House of Delegates of Porto Rico, First Legislative Assembly, Second Session, 1902, submitted by the secretary of the Territory of Porto Rico; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

## BRITISH SHIP FOSCOLIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read. The attention of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is directed to the message.

The message was read, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 29th ultimo (the House of Representatives concurring), I return herewith the bill (S. 173) entitled "An act for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscolia* and cargo." THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, June 2, 1902.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest, inasmuch as the bill is signed by the presiding officers of both Houses, the message and bill had better lie on the table, if that course is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to state that the entire matter set out in the bill has already become a law through the President affixing his signature to the so-called omnibus claims bill. Whatever course is necessary to dispose of the bill I wish to take at the proper time, whether it is to indefinitely postpone it or otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proper course is that the message and bill shall lie on the table, and that order is made.

## PUBLIC BUILDING AT JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Mr. WARREN. I do not want to transgress upon the unanimous-consent agreement, but if there is nothing doing on that I should like to report a joint resolution and ask for its consideration, because it is intended to correct a matter in the public-building bill which lately passed and is now before the Executive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to present, out of order, a report. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 108) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional ground for the post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Jacksonville, Fla., to report it without amendment.

Mr. BACON. If no other Senator desires to speak, I do not know that it would be a violation of the agreement for me to proceed with what I was saying.

Mr. LODGE. Not at all. I hope the Senator from Georgia will proceed, as no other Senator is ready to speak. Of course the unanimous-consent agreement excludes all other business.

Mr. BACON. Of course when any other Senator desires to be recognized, I shall yield the floor to him.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. I hope Senators who wish to speak will do so.

Mr. BACON. I do not desire in any manner to trench upon their rights.

Mr. WARREN. Will not the Senator from Georgia allow the joint resolution to be acted upon?

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon. I thought the Senator was through. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator has any objection—

Mr. BACON. Not at all. It was an inadvertence on my part.

Mr. LODGE. This morning a request was made for unanimous consent to have a bill passed, and objection was made on both sides of the Chamber that it was in violation of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to transgress. As I said, it is merely a correction, and I know that no one will object to it, but at the same time—

Mr. LODGE. I dislike exceedingly to have any violation of the unanimous-consent agreement made, even in a matter of detail.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. BACON. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that this possibly might be an exception, as I understand the Senator from Wyoming to say that it relates to a bill now in the hands of the President, and if the correction is not made there may be no remedy in the future. Am I correct?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; it is in that nature. It applies to the public-building bill, which is in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. BACON. I think under those circumstances the unanimous-consent agreement would not be violated by its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that of the sum authorized at this session of Congress to be expended in enlarging and improving the post-office, court-house, and custom-house at Jacksonville, Fla., the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, use not to exceed \$45,000 for the purchase of additional ground; but such additional ground shall be contiguous to the present site and shall have a frontage on Forsyth and Adams streets of not less than 50 feet and a depth of not less than 208 feet.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. I desire to perfect an amendment offered this morning, which I said I would do after the others were agreed to.

On page 9, line 13, where the words were inserted "shall classify and" I move to insert after "classify" the words "according to its agricultural character and productiveness;" so as to read: "shall classify according to its agricultural character and productiveness and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. The Public Printer can be notified of this additional amendment.

Mr. BACON resumed and concluded his speech. The entire speech is as follows:

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, there has been a good deal said in this debate about the character of the Filipino people, and a good many things have been said which I think are contrary to the facts and unauthorized. I desire to put into the RECORD, in order that they may appear in this debate, some estimates which have been made of this people by those who have had the best opportunity to judge of their capacity.

I will say in the beginning that criticism has been made upon those of us on this side of the Chamber who oppose this bill, that while we profess to deprecate military rule we do not support a bill to establish civil government when the opportunity is offered. It is not the fact that we are unwilling to support a bill to establish civil government, but that we object to a bill which is not proper in itself.

And speaking of the details of the bill I wish to say that in addition to the fundamental objection that no promise of independent nationality is given to the Filipinos, my particular objections to it are two. One is that it fails to give to the Filipinos opportunity for participation in their government through their representatives, and the other is that it affords an opportunity for exploitation, and as I said the other day, I think all matters with respect to the disposition of the property and franchises of those islands should be postponed until the people themselves can have an opportunity to determine what shall be done with reference to them.

My purpose now is not to make anything like a speech, but simply to call attention to and to have put in the RECORD the testimonials which have been given by others as to the capacity of this people. The first person whose testimony I will give is

that of Admiral Dewey. I will remark that many of the extracts, if not all of them, have already been mentioned in the Senate at various times, but I desire them to appear consecutively as a part of the debate.

On the 27th of June, 1898, in response to a telegram sent to him by the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Dewey sent this reply, which will be found in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1898, volume 2, page 103:

In my opinion these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.

DEWEY.

Then in Senate Document 63, which contains the documents sent by the executive department to the Senate, there is another dispatch from Admiral Dewey, found on page 383, in which he says this, referring to the former telegram:

In a telegram sent to the Department on June 23 I expressed the opinion that "these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races." Further intercourse with them has confirmed me in this opinion.

We have sent two commissions to the Philippine Islands which have made very careful examinations into the question as to the capacity of the Filipinos to participate in their own government. Each of these commissions has sent a recommendation, which is before the Senate, that the Filipinos be permitted to have participation in their government to the extent of the election of a representative body by them which shall be clothed with legislative powers. The Schurman Commission and the Taft Commission have both made that recommendation.

The Schurman Commission made a very elaborate examination into the question of the capacity of the Filipino people and their character, and the testimony takes up almost the entire second volume of the report of the Schurman Commission, where is set out the testimony of a great many witnesses, men of standing and capacity, and who have had opportunity to judge. The testimony is abundant in that volume as to the belief that these people are of sufficient intelligence and character to participate through representative bodies in the control of their own government. As a result of that examination and as a conclusion, the Commission, on page 119 of the first volume of their report, use this language in giving the reasons why in their opinion those people are capacitated to participate in their own government.

For this confidence it has the following, among other grounds: First, the study by educated Filipinos of the various examples of constitutional government has resulted in their selection, as best adapted to the conditions and character of the various peoples inhabiting the archipelago, of almost precisely the political institutions and arrangements which have been worked out in practice by the American people; and these are also, though less definitely apprehended, the political ideas of the masses of the Philippine people themselves.

This point has been frequently illustrated in the course of the preceding exposition, and it must here suffice to say that the commission was constantly surprised by the harmony subsisting between the rights, privileges, and institutions enjoyed by Americans and the reforms desired by the best Filipinos. Secondly, in addition to the adaptation of the American form of government to the Filipinos, the Filipinos themselves are of unusually promising material. They possess admirable domestic and personal virtues, and though they are uncontrollable when such elemental passions as jealousy, revenge, or resentment are once aroused, most of them—practically all of the civilized inhabitants of Luzon and Visayas—are naturally and normally peaceful, docile, and deferential to constituted authority.

On the suppression of the insurrection the great majority of them will be found to be good, law-abiding citizens. Thirdly, though the majority of the inhabitants are uneducated, they evince a strong desire to be instructed, and the example of Japan is with them a cherished ideal of the value of modern education. A system of free schools for the people—another American institution, it will be noted—has been an important element in every Philippine programme of reforms. Fourthly, the educated Filipinos, though constituting a minority, are far more numerous than is generally supposed, and are scattered all over the archipelago; and the Commission desires to bear the strongest testimony to the high range of their intelligence, and not only to their intellectual training, but also to their social refinement, as well as to the grace and charm of the personal character. These educated Filipinos, in a word, are the equals of men one meets in similar vocations, law, medicine, business, etc., in Europe or America.

That which I have just read is a part of the report of the Schurman Commission, of which Professor Schurman, Mr. Denby, Professor Worcester, Admiral Dewey, and, I believe, General Otis, were members.

In a book published by a member of the same Commission, written before the Spanish war and at a time when there was no inducement to partisanship, entitled "The Philippine Islands," by Dean C. Worcester, on page 479, he draws this very attractive and interesting picture of the character and social conditions of the Filipinos.

The civilized Filipino certainly has many good qualities to offset his bad traits. The traveler can not fail to be impressed by his open-handed and cheerful hospitality. He will go to any amount of trouble, and often to no little expense, in order to accommodate some perfect stranger who has not the slightest claim on him; and he never turns one of his own race from his door.

If cleanliness be next to godliness, he certainly has much to recommend him. Every village has its bath, if there is any chance for one, and men, women, and children patronize it liberally. Should the situation of a town be unfortunate in this particular, its people will carry water from a great distance if necessary, and in any event will keep clean.

Hardly less noticeable than the almost universal hospitality are the well-regulated homes and the happy family life, which one soon finds to be the

rule. Children are orderly, respectful, and obedient to their parents. Wives are allowed an amount of liberty hardly equaled in any other Eastern country, and they seldom abuse it. More often than not they are the financiers of their families, and I have frequently been referred by the head of a house to "mi mujer" when I wished to make a bargain. Women have their share of the work to do, but it is a just share, and they perform it without question and without grumbling.

At vespers in the evening there is always a pretty scene. An instant hush comes over the busy village. In each house father, mother, and children fall on their knees before the image or picture of some saint and repeat their prayers. The devotions over, each child kisses the hand of his father and his mother, at the same time wishing them good evening. He then makes an obeisance to each of his brothers and sisters, as well as to each guest who happens to be present, repeating his pleasant salutation with each funny bow. Host and hostess also greet one in the same way, and in remote places, where white men are a rarity, the little tots often kneel to kiss one's hand.

The civilized native is self-respecting and self-restrained to a remarkable degree. He is patient under misfortune and forbearing under provocation. While it is stretching the truth to say that he never reveals anger, he certainly succeeds much better in controlling himself than does the average European. When he does give way to passion, however, he is as likely as not to become for the moment a maniac and to do someone a fatal injury.

He is a kind father and a dutiful son. His aged relatives are never left in want, but are brought to his home and are welcome to share the best that it affords to the end of their days.

Among his fellows he is genial and sociable. He loves to sing, dance, and make merry. He is a born musician, and, considering the sort of instruments at his disposal, and especially the limited advantages which he has for perfecting himself in their use, his performances on them are often very remarkable.

He is naturally fearless and admires nothing so much as bravery in others. Under good officers he makes an excellent soldier, and he is ready to fight to the death for his honor or his home.

Mr. President, in connection with what I read from Admiral Dewey, making comparison between the capacity and the intelligence of the Filipinos and the Cubans and awarding superiority to the Filipinos, I desire to say that I have asked a great many Army officers, who have served both in Cuba and in the Philippines, what their estimate was, and without a single exception every Army officer has given me the same opinion that Admiral Dewey expressed in these two telegrams to the Secretary of the Navy, that the Filipinos are superior in point of capacity and intelligence to the Cubans. Of course, he is speaking of the average of the two peoples.

It is exceedingly gratifying to me that the testimony of Admiral Dewey and the statement of Professor Worcester in his book is corroborated by all of the official documents which have been sent to us by the Executive Department in regard to that matter and also by the testimony which has been taken before the Senate Committee on the Philippines.

I have in my hand a part of the testimony. I can not refer to a great many things that are in it, but I will refer to a few only. Governor Taft is very emphatic in his commendation of the Philippine people as a people of character and good disposition and intelligence. On page 410 of the testimony there is this question and answer, the chairman asking the question of Governor Taft:

The Filipinos are temperate?  
Governor TAFT. Yes, sir; the Filipinos are temperate, but they drink. They drink a little vino, and vino shops have been very largely reduced since our occupancy and under the civil government.

Then Governor Taft, in response to another question on the same page, said what I shall read:

The CHAIRMAN. The sale of liquor has been regulated and reduced since you have been there?

Governor TAFT. Yes, sir; it has; and I venture to say that the moral condition of the city of Manila is as good as that of any American city I know of.

On page 77 of the same volume of testimony there is a statement by Governor Taft in the nature of a voluntary statement on his part, and I think it important to call attention to it in view of the very general and unqualified assertions which have been made as to the character of the Filipinos in their prosecution of the war. Governor Taft says:

I desire to say, with respect to the treatment of American prisoners by the insurgent officers high in command, that there was usually very little to criticize. When you get to officers lower in command you will find instances of the murder of American prisoners, not many, but enough to cause comment as to the difference in treatment.

In this connection I read the cablegram, to which I have already called attention, from Admiral Dewey, of June 27. He says:

HONGKONG, June 27, 1898.

SECRETARY OF NAVY, Washington:

Receipt of telegram of June 14 is acknowledged. Aguinaldo, insurgent leader, with 13 of his staff, arrived May 19, by permission, on *Nanshan*. Established self Cavite, outside arsenal, under the protection of our guns, and organized his army. I have had several conferences with him, generally of a personal nature.

Consistently, I have refrained from assisting him in any way with the force under my command, and on several occasions I have declined requests that I should do so, telling him the squadron could not act until the arrival of the United States troops. At the same time I have given him to understand that I consider insurgents as friends, being opposed to a common enemy. He has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government. Aguinaldo has acted independently of the squadron, but has kept me advised of his progress, which has been wonderful. I have allowed to pass by water recruits, arms, and ammunition, and to take such Spanish arms and ammunition from the arsenal as he needed.

Here is the part to which I wish to call attention:

Have advised frequently to conduct the war humanely, which he has done invariably. My relations with him are cordial, but I am not in his confidence. The United States has not been bound in any way to assist insurgents



by any act or promises, and he is not to my knowledge committed to assist us. I believe he expects to capture Manila without my assistance, but doubt ability, they not yet having many guns. In my opinion these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.

DEWEY.

General MacArthur, in his testimony before the Committee on the Philippines, said what I shall read. He was speaking as to the policy of granting to the Filipinos the opportunity to participate through representative government in the control of their own affairs. I can not go back entirely, but I will take up enough to make the connection.

Senator CARMACK. Will not that depend very largely on granting them at least a considerable measure of political rights and share in the government that is established over them?

General MACARTHUR. Undoubtedly, and they are getting that.

Senator CARMACK. In what way?

General MACARTHUR. They have almost complete control of their municipal governments. They have been given a very considerable control of the provincial government, and what they get in the general government depends upon future action. So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to give them a very considerable voice.

Senator BEVERIDGE. Do I understand you by that to mean that as they demonstrate their fitness and capability in these minor and smaller fields of political action their participation in larger affairs would be increased accordingly?

General MACARTHUR. Yes; I think of course that is—

Senator PATTERSON. I do not think it is just or fair for the Senator to make such a statement—

Senator CARMACK. I understand you to say that you would be willing to give them a very considerable share in the general government?

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

Senator CARMACK. Do you think they should have that now?

General MACARTHUR. I would be willing to give it to them, as I have said. I have become attached to those people and have a good deal of faith in them.

Senator CARMACK. You speak of them as quick, generous, and intelligent people.

General MACARTHUR. I so consider them. Of course the society is classified, as it is everywhere else.

Senator CARMACK. But as a whole, General, I believe in your reports you speak of the Filipino people in an appreciative way—as a people with considerable native intelligence, quick and apt and generous, flexible and teachable.

General MACARTHUR. I believe that is the general tenor.

Senator CARMACK. That is the general tenor of your reports?

General MACARTHUR. Yes.

Senator CARMACK. You do not regard the people of the Philippine Islands, as a whole, as a miserable, corrupt, cruel, and a degraded race, do you, General?

General MACARTHUR. Oh, by no means.

And so on.

Now, Mr. President, there is a very interesting and detailed statement made as to the character and social conditions of the Philippine people, to which the attention of the Senate has more than once been called, and parts of which have been inserted in the RECORD, but which I desire now to have read in this connection.

It was alluded to on Saturday by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], and the effect of these statements by two naval officers was endeavored to in some degree be depreciated by the suggestion that the officers did not have an opportunity to see anything except such things as the Filipino people desired them to see, in order that they might not have a true appreciation of conditions as they existed; but the fact is that these two officers were for several weeks going through the islands, and the general narration which they gave shows that they saw not a limited and circumscribed part of the conditions as they existed, but that they mingled generally with the people and had the best of opportunity for forming an estimate of their character and their social condition and habits.

It is a report made by two naval officers, Paymaster W. B. Wilcox and Naval Cadet L. R. Sargent, who made an extended tour through northern Luzon in the autumn of 1898. This is an extract from a book written on the Philippines by Albert G. Robinson, and it is found beginning on page 284.

I will state that this visit was made by these two officers at a time when the American Army was in Manila, and when the entire island of Luzon, to say nothing of any other part of the archipelago, was under the control of the Filipino government, and that whatever there was of order and of orderly government in that island at that time was entirely under the authority of the Filipino government, with which the American Government at that time had no connection, and over which the American Army attempted to exercise no control.

As it is a little long I will ask that the Secretary may read it for me, and in order that the connection may be maintained I will ask him to begin at the beginning of the chapter, on page 282, and read through to page 290, or so much as may be necessary to preserve the continuity, the whole of it being afterwards reproduced in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

On August 20, 1898, the never wholly quenched flame of rebellion against an obnoxious rule broke out afresh in the Philippine Islands. Although interrupted at times, and seemingly ended by the treaty of Biacnabato, the fire still burned, and it is now known that at the time of the arrival of the

American Army in Manila, in June, 1898, almost the entire area of the Philippines—practically all, with the exception of one or two of the larger coast cities—was in the hands of the insurgents. Not only were they in control of the country; they were administering its political affairs as well.

This they continued to do for the greater part of the island throughout the following year, practically until the autumn of 1899. Up to that time the territory occupied by the forces of the United States in the island of Luzon was confined to a very limited area in the vicinity of Manila, with a flamentary extension northward for some 50 or 60 miles along the Manila-Dagupan Railway. Very much the same condition obtained on the other islands. One thing is certain; although greatly disturbed by the conditions of war, this territory was under some form of governmental administration.

Luzon is approximately as large as Ohio, and the principal islands of the Visayan group cover an area a little less than that of West Virginia. I leave out the southern islands, Mindanao and the rest, because they never had much government anyway. That this sixty or seventy thousand square miles of territory in Luzon and Visaya is not inhabited by savages is now apparent. Between the downfall of Spanish authority and the American military occupation there was an interim of more than a year. Who governed the country during that time?

Few facts are known concerning the Administration during that period. Conflicting reports reached Manila. Official headquarters reported the receipt of many complaints of a state of anarchy. Private sources reported a state of law and order. Personal observation and investigation was impossible for foreigners. The latest wholly reliable information was obtained by two American naval officers, Paymaster W. B. Wilcox and Naval Cadet L. R. Sargent, who made an extended tour through northern Luzon in the autumn of 1898. Their trip was made before the opening of hostilities between the Americans and the Filipinos, and after a Filipino government had been established and in operation for several months. Mr. Sargent's story of their journey was published in the Outlook, and because of its value and exceeding interest I take the liberty of quoting a review of it here.

Mr. Sargent, in opening his article, recalls the conditions in October and November, 1898, when the journey was made:

"It will be remembered that at that date the United States had not yet announced its policy with regard to the Philippines. The terms of the treaty with Spain were being negotiated by our commissioners at Paris, and the fate of the islands hung in the balance. In the meantime the native population, taking matters into their own hands, had declared their independence from all foreign jurisdiction, and had set up a provisional government with Aguinaldo at its head. Although this government has never been recognized, and in all probability will go out of existence without recognition, yet it can not be denied that, in a region occupied by many millions of inhabitants, for nearly six months it stood alone between anarchy and order.

"The military forces of the United States held control only in Manila, with its environs, and in Cavite, and had no authority to proceed farther; while in the vast remaining districts the representatives of the only other recognized power on the field were prisoners in the hands of their despised subjects. It was the opinion at Manila during this anomalous period in our Philippine relations, and possibly in the United States as well, that such a state of affairs must breed something akin to anarchy. I can state unreservedly, however, that Mr. Wilcox and I found the existing conditions to be much at variance with this opinion. During our absence from Manila we traveled more than 600 miles in a very comprehensive circuit through the northern part of the island of Luzon, traversing a characteristic and important district.

"In this way we visited seven provinces, of which some were under the immediate control of the central government at Malolos, while others were remotely situated, separated from each other and from the seat of government by natural divisions of land, and accessible only by lengthy and arduous travel. As a tribute to the efficiency of Aguinaldo's government and to the law-abiding character of his subjects, I offer the fact that Mr. Wilcox and I pursued our journey throughout in perfect security and returned to Manila with only the most pleasing recollections of the quiet and orderly life which we found the natives to be leading under the new régime."

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia how much of this volume he proposes to have read.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly willing that the remainder of it shall be inserted in the RECORD without reading. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALLISON. The whole volume?

Mr. BACON. No; only the extracts made from the report of these two naval officers, and the only part—

Mr. ALLISON. That report has been printed in the RECORD two or three times.

Mr. BACON. I stated, though the Senator was not in the Chamber at the time, that it had been previously partly read to the Senate, and that I simply desired it to be put in in this connection. Of course, I do not desire to detain the Senate by reading it.

Mr. ALLISON. I think everybody knows the situation under which these naval officers passed through the island of Luzon, when they passed through there, and the surrounding circumstances. I remember very well it was read here once before, and that it was distinctly stated that in every town they came to they found officers of the so-called Filipino army. I only object to any lengthy reading of this volume, written by some gentleman—

Mr. BACON. No; I do not want to have any part of the volume read except simply the connecting parts, the fragments of this report, the parts which connect the one with the other.

Mr. ALLISON. In a fifteen-minute debate we can probably dispense with the reading of a portion of this volume, unless the Senator from Georgia very much desires it. I have no objection, however, to a reprint of what these two officers say.

Mr. BACON. I have stated that I did not desire it read if it could be put into the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that there are two or three more pages, and, in the absence of objection, they will be inserted in the RECORD without reading. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

The remainder of the report referred to is as follows:

In his descriptions of the many towns they passed through Mr. Sargent leaves on the mind only a picture of peace, order, and happiness among a bright, intelligent, and ambitious people, although their knowledge of the affairs of the world was limited. Quotations from the article will illustrate this effect upon the reader.

"From Nueva Viscaya for the next three weeks of travel we passed from one hospitable town to another and enjoyed a round of novel entertainments. Our route now carried us through the valley of the Rio Grande Cagayan, probably the largest area of level country in Luzon Island. With the exception of the region in the immediate vicinity of Manila and of the narrow strip of land along the western coast, this valley, previous to the revolution, was the firmest and most ancient seat of Spanish authority on the island. Its towns throughout give evidence of the labor that has been expended on them. There are comparatively few nipa huts and many substantial frame buildings. Each town, moreover, has an elaborate church and convent, usually built of brick.

"Many of these churches date back into the last century, one which I remember particularly bearing the date of 1780 as that of its completion. Our entertainment in the different towns varied according to the facilities at hand, but in all cases music was a leading feature. In the absence of all accessories the village band would be called into the building in which we were received, and would play tune after tune well into the night while we conversed at our ease with the village fathers. At the little village of Cordon, which has a population of only a few hundred, we passed one of the pleasantest evenings of our journey. In this instance four accomplished little girls gave the entertainment its particular charm. Soon after our arrival the entire village trooped into the large room of the public building that had been turned over to our party. The floor was cleared for a dance, and the band commenced with a waltz.

"The towns of Ilagan and Aparri, with their wealthy and pleasure-loving population, provided the most elaborate entertainment. Ilagan is the capital city of the tobacco-raising province of Isabela and is situated near the head of navigation of the Rio Grande. Aparri is situated at its mouth in the province of Cagayan and is the only seaport of the valley. These towns are laid out in regular streets and have many squares of substantial frame buildings. They have each a population of between 10,000 and 15,000. We spent three days at Ilagan, and I think that it was here that we were brought into closest touch with the Filipino character.

"The cultured class, which I have spoken of before, was strongly in evidence, and I think that before leaving we had discussed views with nearly every member of it. They all realized that they were passing through a crucial period in the history of their people, and young and old were eager to acquire all possible knowledge that might assist them to think clearly at this crisis. Their realization of the gravity of their position did not, however, rob their character of its natural gaiety, nor make them forget their duty as hosts. On the evening following our arrival a ball was given in our honor, which was attended by all the élite of the town.

"There were present about 50 young women and twice that number of men. All were dressed in European fashion. The girls were pleasant and intelligent. The men comported themselves in all respects like gentlemen. It was hard to realize that we were in the very heart of a country generally supposed to be given up to semisavages. At intervals between dances many songs were sung, usually by one or two of the guests, while all frequently joined in the chorus. The national hymn was repeated several times with great enthusiasm. The ball lasted until nearly 3 o'clock in the morning and broke up with good feeling at its height.

"On the second evening we were invited to attend the theater, where two one-act Spanish plays were presented by the young society people of the town. The theater itself had been constructed by the villagers only a few weeks before. It was a large bamboo structure, one end of which was used as the village market, while the stage occupied the other end. The stage arrangements were good; curtain, side scenes, and footlight all en règle. In the performance of the play we saw our friends—the typical young Filipinos—in a light in which very few of our nation have had an opportunity to view them. They comported themselves with credit in a position where humor, intelligence, and artistic ability were the requisites of success.

"During our stay at Ilagan we lived at the house of the mayor. This building was of great size and was built of magnificent hard wood from the neighboring forest. One wing, containing a reception room and two bedrooms, was turned over to us. The reception room was very large, with a finely polished floor and with windows along two sides. It contained a piano and a set of excellent bamboo furniture, including the most comfortable chairs and divans imaginable. There were two tall mirrors on the wall and a number of old-fashioned pictures and framed paper flowers. \* \* \* There was one form of hospitality which we met at Ilagan and Aparri that we would gladly have avoided. I still shudder to recall the stupendous dinners that were spread before us night after night. The Filipinos pride themselves on their cookery, and it is indeed excellent."

Mr. Sargent, in testifying as to the drinking habits of the natives, says he did not once see an intoxicated man on his journey. He continues:

"Our party proceeded on the *Oso* from Aparri around the northwestern corner of the island and landed on the coast near the northern end of the province of South Ilocos. From here we proceeded by land southward through the western provinces. During this part of our journey we were thrown into closer association than previously with the military element of the population, of which I hope to have an opportunity to speak further in a subsequent article.

"The towns on the western coast are even larger than those on the Rio Grande. Vigan, the capital of South Ilocos, has a population of about 28,000, and Candon, farther to the southward, is not far behind this figure. The mayor of Candon was of the hustler type, and was evidently on the outlook for an opportunity to 'boom' his town. On our departure he presented us with a written description of its exceptionally desirable location from a business standpoint. Every town gave evidence of the bitter fighting that had taken place between the natives and the Spaniards, many of the larger buildings which had been used for defense being riddled with bullet holes.

"We no longer passed from town to town through unsettled stretches of country. The fields on both sides of the road were under cultivation and were dotted with laborers, while on the road itself there were always many travelers. The laborers in the fields worked in the shade of large screens of nipa leaves, which they carried with them from place to place."

In conclusion, Mr. Sargent says:

"I can not see what better gauge we can obtain at present of the intelligence and ambition of the whole Philippine race than the progress that has been made by its favored members with the limited opportunities at their command. Throughout the islands a thirst for knowledge is manifested and an extravagant respect for those who possess it.

"I have seen a private native citizen in a town in the interior exercise a more powerful influence than all the native officials over the minds of the inhabitants, simply because he was known to have been educated in the best schools at Manila, and was regarded, for that reason, as a superior man. The heroes of these people are not heroes of war, but of science and inven-

tion. Without rival, the American who is best known by reputation in Luzon is Mr. Edison, and any native with the slightest pretension to education whom you may question on the subject will take delight in reciting a list of his achievements. The ruling Filipinos, during the existence of their provincial government, appreciated the necessity of providing public schools to be accessible to the poorer inhabitants.

"Had events so shaped themselves as to have provided an opportunity for carrying into effect the plans formed on this point, it seems possible that the mental plane of the entire population might have been raised gradually to a surprising height.

"Out of respect to the statements of other people, which the narrative of my experience may seem to contradict, I wish to say that I have found the native of the interior of Luzon an astonishingly different character from the one ordinarily met in Manila. Previous to my journey I regarded those whom I had encountered in that city with great dislike, and after my return I was unable to overcome that feeling. They are not a fair sample of the race, and I can not expect anyone who has formed his judgment on the subject merely from observations of that type to express an opinion similar to mine as recorded above."

The experience of these gentlemen does not point to any very fruitful soil for widespread anarchy, such as sundry alarmists have pictured as the result of Filipino self-government.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass upon the time of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CULLOM. What is the order of business, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CULLOM. There seems to be nothing going on here.

Would it be in order to lay aside this bill and consider any other bill or subject? It seems that there is no disposition on the part of Senators to speak or to consider amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that the agreement was, and it may be so understood by Senators who are absent, that no other business would be considered to-day or tomorrow but the Philippine bill.

Mr. CULLOM. Will it be in order to move to go into executive session for the purpose of considering executive business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Beyond doubt.

Mr. CULLOM. Unless some Senator desires to occupy the attention of the Senate, I shall very soon ask the Senate to go into executive session.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I desire to address the Senate, but not until the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] is present.

Mr. KEAN. I ask unanimous consent to consider a bill on the Calendar, in which the Senator from Iowa is very much interested. There does not seem to be any objection to it. It is the bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of Charles H. Robinson.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Are we taking up the Calendar now, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that it is not in order.

Mr. STEWART. Everything is out of order except the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. KEAN. I can ask unanimous consent, I suppose.

Mr. STEWART. You can not have unanimous consent, because I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not object to the unanimous consent, as there seems to be nothing doing here now.

Mr. STEWART. I insist on the regular order.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know; but there is no regular order now, except silence.

Mr. LODGE. The regular order is the consideration of the Philippine bill under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Beyond a question.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand, the unanimous-consent agreement limits debate upon any amendment to fifteen minutes. Now, these amendments are not offered one by one and acted upon, but they are upon the table, and any one of them, as I understand, is subject to discussion, and that is the only way it can be done.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; that is quite right.

Mr. BACON. I do not know in what way we can proceed unless a Senator may be allowed to discuss any amendment which he may call up.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. If no one else desires to call up any amendment I have a right to call up one, as I understand, and discuss it or any pending amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly. That is what the fifteen-minute rule was made for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. I will then say that I desire to submit some few remarks in reference to the amendment which proposes to give a representative body to the Filipinos, which is embraced, as I understand, in the substitute offered by the minority. In addition



to what I shall say personally and what is really of more importance, I propose to submit some extracts from an address recently delivered by Doctor Schurman, the president of the first Philippine Commission.

The question as to whether or not the Filipinos should be allowed representation, of course is largely involved in and dependent upon the question whether they are capacitated for it; and therefore the pursuit of the subject on which I was engaged when my limit of time was reached is not out of order, nor am I seeking here by any device to bring in a subject not germane, but, on the contrary, my discussion is strictly germane to that question.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] on Saturday last made a very broad statement that there were no schools in the Philippine Islands other than those which were furnished by the Americans. Of course he was speaking in a general sense, but even in that sense his statement was unwarranted by the facts. I have a little memorandum here, which I think is of interest, and which certainly is in conflict with that very broad statement made by the Senator.

In the city and suburbs of Cebu, prior to the occupation of the American forces, there was a very comprehensive and extensive public-school system. The city of Cebu is on the island of Cebu, one of the Visayan islands, and contains, with its suburbs, 37,000 inhabitants. In that city of 37,000 inhabitants, prior to American occupation and subsequent to American occupation, and prior to any institution of American schools, there were these native schools: In two seminaries and in the public schools of that city of 37,000 inhabitants there were 3,000 students. Eight hundred of them were in the male seminary, 450 of them were in the female seminary, and the remainder of them in the ordinary public schools of the city. The public schools, educating outside of the seminaries some eighteen hundred children, were supported entirely by the people of the community, almost all of whom were native Filipinos.

Mr. President, it is certainly a most remarkable fact in the consideration of the intelligence of that people and of their effort to improve themselves and educate their children that in a city of 37,000 inhabitants there should be these seminaries and this public-school system, with 3,000 students in attendance. That was the condition prior to the occupation of the Americans in February, 1899, and it continued thereafter. I do not think that even yet there has been a complete organization of American schools in that island. There had been a very partial one up to last summer, and those native schools were still in existence.

I will state to the Senate that that information is not mere hearsay, but was given to me on the ground by an officer of the Army who was on duty and I think occupied the position of assistant adjutant-general of that department, not attached to the personal staff, but an official position which required of him to have this information, and it was given to me by him personally.

It is due that I should say that the male seminary and the female seminary, being institutions of higher learning, were not entirely dependent for their scholars upon the local community, but they came from other parts of that island and from the neighboring islands, just as in the same way in this country students come from different parts to institutions of higher learning than they can get in their immediate locality.

What is true of schools in Cebu is true in greater or less degree in all the important cities and towns of the Philippines. In a much greater degree it is true in Manila, where there is a university and colleges and schools of high rank. I have cited Cebu specially only because I happened to have the figures in that case.

I have already read, Mr. President, the statement of the Schurman Commission, made as the conclusion of their very elaborate examination, that the educated people of the Philippine Islands are the equals of men one meets in similar vocations—law, medicine, business, etc.—in Europe or America. This language is strong, sir, because it is direct and without qualification. It is the conclusion of men than whom in opportunity and capacity to accurately judge there are none superior.

In the more limited opportunity for observation which was afforded to me I saw, not only in Manila, but in the smaller towns and even in the villages, homes which were the abodes of refinement and most cordial hospitality, where were found that surest index of civilization—accomplished and gracious women. What I say in this regard will, I am sure, be indorsed by every officer who has seen service in the Philippines.

I have alluded to the fact that both the Schurman Commission and the Taft Commission have recommended in their reports that these people be allowed to have a representative government. Governor Taft, in his testimony before the committee, repeats it. His testimony is to be found on page 333 of the evidence taken before the Philippine Committee. Governor Taft used this language:

I think that a popular assembly is what the people desire, and I think it is the best possible means of educating their educated men in popular government.

It will give them an opportunity to meet, to express their views, to take part in legislation, to propose and enact laws which they deem useful in the country; it will give them a part in the government, and will by practice teach them what self-government is. We recommend that in our report, and I am sure that with that the people will have confidence that our statement to them, that we desire to educate them in self-government and give them a measure of self-government, increasing it gradually as they become more fitted for it, is true.

Senator ALLISON. It is a legislative body of all the provinces; that is, it is a general body?

Governor TAFT. Yes, sir. I would not include therein the Moro provinces, for, as I have already stated, the Moros do not desire popular government.

In another place he recommends that they be allowed to elect such a popular representative body not later than January, 1904.

The Schurman Commission was even more emphatic in its recommendation in this regard. Its views are echoed in the recent address of President Schurman, extracts from which, with the consent of the Senate, I shall include in my remarks.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

The time approaches to set our Philippine compass by the fixed stars.

I take as my starting point the motives and objects with which we went into the Philippines. They were impressively voiced by President McKinley, and I have already told you how he set them forth to me three years ago. Our purpose was not selfish, it was humanitarian; it was not the vanity of self-aggrandizement, it was not the greed of power and dominion; no, no, not these, but altruism caring for the happiness of others, philanthropy relieving the Filipinos of oppression and conferring on them the blessings of liberty. This was the supreme consideration with President McKinley.

The political emancipation of the Filipinos was the controlling object with the President and the people of the United States. I am of course aware that other and less worthy aims appealed to individual Americans and to groups of Americans. It would be strange if it were otherwise, considering how diversified human motives are apt to be. The jingo saw in the annexation of the Philippines another avenue for spread-eagleism; to Americans in the Orient it meant an accession of American influence in Asia; to the Protestant churchman it offered a new field for missionary enterprise; the exploiting capitalist was fascinated by the riches of Philippine forests, lands, and mines, which showed like "the wealth of Ormus or of Ind;" and the sensational press, still delirious from the fever of war and surfeited with the staleness of piping peace, discerned in the Philippines material for new sensations which promised to be as stirring as the excitant was remote, unknown, and dangerously explosive.

All these influences, and others, were undoubtedly at work. Yet, it was not these forces singly or in combination that carried the day; it was the humanitarian object of liberating the Filipinos from Spanish tyranny and bestowing upon them the boon of freedom that decided the President and people of the United States to compel Spain to cede to us her sovereignty over the Philippine Islands.

Fortunate, indeed, that no lower motive prevailed. Any other object than the humanitarian one of carrying the gift of freedom to the Filipinos would have ended in vast and bitter disappointment, or, perhaps, even in poignant remorse. Did we need the Philippines to make our power felt in Asia? No, for we can exert the most potent national influence in all quarters of the world without owning adjacent territory, as our recent experiences in Pekin and Panama have demonstrated to the satisfaction of the most incredulous.

And had we gone into the Philippines for commercial gain, when, think you, would our traders' profits have amounted to the hundreds of millions of dollars which the archipelago has already cost us? And what shall I say of the thousands of brave and generous young Americans who have lost their lives in the Philippines? No prospect of profit however assured, no wealth or advantage however colossal, could ever atone for the precious American lifeblood swallowed up by the hungry soil of Luzon and the Visayas. For such a sacrifice there is only one justification. It is the discharge of duty, service in a righteous cause. If our presence in the Philippines be not justified in its purpose and intent, then our soldiers' blood is on our hands; aye, and all the blood, in that case innocent, of the Filipinos we have fought, the misery we have caused their families, and the devastation we have wrought in their homes.

This awful responsibility we can not escape either before our own consciences or at the bar of history unless we have done what we have done in the Philippines for the sake of redeeming the Filipinos from foreign oppression, saving them from domestic anarchy, and leading them into the ways of self-government and freedom—a blessing at once unmeasured and immeasurable. But I assert that to confer this blessing was the final cause of our acceptance from Spain of sovereignty over the Philippines. Nothing has happened since to alter our purpose. Indeed, all subsequent occurrences have gone to confirm the wisdom and transcendent nobility of this end and to exhibit the folly and delusion of any other end. Self-seeking ends of every sort are excluded by American policy and stultified by actual conditions in the Philippines. We are in the Philippines for the sake of the Filipinos; but while American sovereignty is to the Filipinos a great boon, to us this extension of sovereignty is not advantageous, but burdensome.

I wish the Federal Constitution might be amended so as to provide for the perpetual exclusion of Asiatic countries from partnership in our great American Republic. But, whether the Constitution be amended or left intact, I am sure it is the policy of the American people to admit no Asiatic country to the status and privileges of a State or Territory in this Republic of the United States of America. Consequently that independence which is the final term of progressive liberty for the Filipinos, since it can not realize itself by incorporation in our union of American States, must, perforce, when the hour arrives, find embodiment in a separate and self-contained national organization.

Thus, if you look beyond the present and the near future, you descry in the distance an independent and sovereign Philippine republic. The watchword of progress, the key to the future of the political development of the archipelago, is neither colonialism nor federalism but nationalism. The destiny of the Philippine Islands is not to be a State or Territory in the United States of America but a daughter republic of ours—a new birth of liberty on the other side of the Pacific, which shall animate and energize those lovely islands of the tropical seas, and, rearing its head aloft, stand as a monument of progress and a beacon of hope to all the oppressed and benighted millions of the Asiatic continent.

Very well, what then? A colony, a dependency? For a time this status may suffice; as a permanent arrangement it is impossible. For you propose to dower the Filipinos with an ever-increasing measure of liberty; but liberty grows by what it feeds on and moves rapidly to its goal, which is independence. Then, too, the Filipinos have condensed the experience of centuries

into these last half dozen years. They have dreamed of liberty; they have fought for liberty; they have seen in the East the star of independence. These are facts as potent as any other, and deeper than most, in the life of nations.

From the American point of view, then, ever-increasing liberty and self-government is to be our policy toward the Filipinos; and it is the nature of such continuously expanding liberty to issue in independence. This, then, is our programme for the future, both near and remote. And I believe that while the great heart of the American people rejoices at the privilege of granting progressive liberties to the Filipinos, it throbs with still keener delight at the prospect of a day when the process shall be completed by the grant of a perfect independence. This, I say, is the necessary outcome of our policy toward the Filipinos. From the American point of view, Philippine independence is inevitable. And, from the American point of view, Philippine independence is a consummation devoutly to be wished. Let us now see toward what goal the conditions and aspirations of the Filipinos themselves point.

Those Americans, patriotic but unversed in history, who desire to recreate the Filipinos in their own similitude, will always be able to demonstrate that that oriental clay is still without shape and seamliness in the American potter's hand, and that for a perfect product, a vessel of honor and glory, the American wheel must be kept going for years, or perhaps for generations, or possibly even for centuries. Heaven save the Filipinos from such an impertinent and meddling earthly providence! The Filipinos are to develop along their own racial lines, not along ours; and it is colossal conceit and impudence to disparage them because they are different from ourselves.

Capacity for independent self-government does not necessarily mean capacity like ours to administer a commonwealth like ours, but merely capacity of some sort to maintain peace and order, to uphold law, and to fulfill international obligations. It may be a matter of only a short time when the Christian Filipinos of Luzon and the Visayas will be as well qualified to discharge these functions as Mexico, Peru, Argentina, or Venezuela, and when they are so qualified the American Government has no further duty or business in the archipelago. Any decent kind of government of Filipinos by Filipinos is better than the best possible government of Filipinos by Americans.

For that reason, as I have already said, I am anxious to see Congress grant the Filipinos representative institutions at once. It is no argument against this policy that even educated Filipinos do not possess our conception of civil liberty or of official responsibility. With such powers, ideas, and sentiments as they have, get them in harness quickly and let them tug and sweat under the burden of national affairs. This is the way men are trained in government. Political aptitudes and political sentiments are the gift of nature and the acquisition of personal experience; they can not be donated by one person or nation to another. And if you do not at once take the educated Filipinos into active partnership in the government of the Philippine Islands, your monopoly of power, if it does not alienate and embitter them, may have the still worse effect of tending to discourage and emasculate them.

If the Filipinos are to learn to govern themselves in the manner of the really free nations, the sooner they get at it the better. Passive acquiescence, without partnership, in American Government of the Philippines will atrophy their own native capacity for self-government. In that way their dependence would mean their servitude. The beginning of all national, as of all personal, freedom is this: "Son of man, stand upon thy feet!" America can not endow the Filipinos with liberty, but by permitting them to govern themselves, starting now with representative institutions and gradually enlarging their powers, it can at least put them under conditions favorable to the development of liberty. To give them a good government from above without evoking their own active cooperation—as England has done for the people of India—is to sap and atrophy their own capacity for self-government.

In view of subsequent facts and experiences, however, I think it may be not only possible, but feasible, to shorten the period of preparation and transition under American sovereignty. First of all, remember that the first Philippine Commission reported that ultimate independence (after a period of American tutelage) was the goal and aspiration of all intelligent Filipinos. Then we have the testimony of the Taft Commission that the native officials have proved reasonably capable in the administration of public affairs. The test we have made of the governing capacity of the Filipinos has resulted more favorably than could have been anticipated by deduction from their previous political inexperience. Nor is this all, or even the principal item.

Far more important and pregnant of hope is the more or less distinct emergence, under the storm and stress of the last two or three years, of a community of attitude, interest, sentiment, and aspiration, in matters political, among all the Christian peoples of Luzon, the Visayas, and the littoral of Mindanao. Undiscoverable, or at any rate undiscerned, if it existed, in 1899, this consciousness of nationality is to-day so manifest and powerful that General Chaffee, looking at it with the eyes of a military man, has declared, or at least is reported to have declared, that the natives of these islands are all traitors to American sovereignty—all have their hearts set on independence. We know that the strife and passion of war release pent-up mental as well as physical energies and bring to the light of day as realities slumbering fancies, hopes, and sentiments which in times of peace merely flit about the background of consciousness.

It is quite conceivable, therefore, that the restricted aspiration after immediate independence, which the first Philippine Commission discerned in the Philippines (and reported) in 1899, should, after three years of fighting in all or almost all the provinces of Luzon and the Visayas, have become a universal passion, animating and uniting all these diversified communities. This is all the more probable, as from the beginning the racial aspect of the case has been prominent; and as against the white man of America, who succeeded the white man of Europe, the multifarious peoples of Luzon and the Visayas, at least, felt themselves Malaysians and Filipinos. I am not surprised, therefore, if to-day we have to reckon with a universal sentiment and idea of nationality among all the peoples of Luzon and the Visayas with a demand or desire for immediate independence.

I shall not, however, indulge in guesses as to the date when the new fabric should be reared. On that point I desire to be informed by the Filipinos themselves. And I want to hear not the voice of individuals, however prominent, but the voice of the people. There is, however, only one way of securing it. The people can speak only through the representatives they elect to a popular assembly or house of representatives. Here, then, is another reason why Congress should not delay granting representative institutions to the Filipinos.

To secure representative institutions they took up arms against Spain;

the half million educated and propertied Filipinos who would be more immediately represented under the limited suffrage proposed will be conservative rather than radical; and what they, and the poor and ignorant millions of their fellow-citizens for whom they speak, desire, must, in the long run, prevail in the archipelago. The United States is the last people in the world to argue any other people into political subjection. And against a whole nation aspiring and struggling to be independent, it is as impossible to-day to draw up an indictment as it was when Burke repudiated the task in connection with the people of the 13 American colonies.

If the Filipinos desire independence, they should have it when they are qualified to exercise it. The reports of General Chaffee and Governor Taft demonstrate (whatever their own personal views) that the difficulties in the way of independence are gradually disappearing. Let a Philippine popular assembly or house of representatives say whether the Filipinos want independence or not and, if so, at what date they think the grant should be conferred, and we shall then have before us all the conditions necessary for the final solution of the Philippine problem.

If it appears probable, as recent experience seems to indicate, that the Christian Filipinos of Luzon and the Visayas might, at no distant day, govern themselves as well as the average Central or South American Republic, then, in the name of American liberty and democracy, in the name of the political aspirations and ideals of the Filipinos, and in the name of justice and humanity, let the Philippine republic be established. As President McKinley said to me three years ago, we went into the Philippines solely with the humanitarian object of conferring the blessings of liberty on the Filipinos. In its highest potency, liberty and independence are one and inseparable.

And to repeat what ought not to need repetition anywhere within the limits of our free Republic, any decent kind of government of Filipinos by Filipinos is better than the best possible government of Filipinos by Americans.

Mr. BACON. I want to say, Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for speaking of anything included in my personal experience in the Philippines, that my observation of that people satisfied me that they were a very far superior people to what I supposed they were before I went there. They are in some respects far superior to any other Asiatic people I have ever seen. They certainly have a very much higher regard for the outward observance of the decencies and modesties of life, as we understand them and as we observe them, immeasurably more so, than any other Asiatic race which it has ever been my fortune to see. What is the cause of that I do not know, unless it is the ameliorating influences of Christianity upon them, for it is a fact, Mr. President, that they are, speaking of them generally, a Christian people and a people of great devotion to their religion.

Something has been said here about the Filipinos having organized the only republic ever organized in Asia, and there has been controversy as to whether or not they did in fact organize a true republic. I do not propose to go into that question, but there is one thing that I think is absolutely true, and that is that they are the only Christian people in the whole of Asia, either on the mainland or on the islands of that continent. If there is any other Christian people in the whole of Asia, except the Filipinos, I do not know of them. In that vast continent, embracing nearly one-half of the entire human race, among them all there is no Christian people except the Filipinos. Of course, I do not include in that statement the Russians who have gone to Siberia, because they are not an Asiatic people, but a European people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Among those Christian people of whom the Senator speaks, does he include the Moros?

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator include the Igorrotes?

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator, I will state exactly what I do include. I include the Visayans, who constitute some 2,600,000 people; I include the Tagalogs and others of the islands of Luzon and the neighboring islands, making in all, according to the report of the Schurman Commission, some 6,500,000 people. Those are the number whom I include.

Out of an estimated population of between 8,000,000 and 10,000,000 people, 6,500,000 of them are devoted Christians. There are more than twice as many Christians in the Philippines than there were people of every class in the thirteen colonies when they wrested their independence from England and founded this mighty nation. They do not belong to the denominations which are most popular—when I say "popular" I mean most numerous—in the United States, but they are none the less most devoted Christians, and the number of them is stated by the Schurman Commission to be 6,500,000. In everything except language they are one people—in religion, in blood, in dress, in habits, in domestic and social customs and observances, and in a strong feeling of common nationality. Whatever was formerly lacking in this last regard they have now been welded together in the white heat of four years' war.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, that all I have said in reference to the Philippine people relates to this particular class and does not include the Moros nor the Negritos nor the Igorrotes. I am speaking of those who are recognized as the representative people of the islands. The Moros, the Senator from Indiana will recognize, are not called there Filipinos in the Moro country. When you go into Mindanao, where there are a great many Moros and also a great many of those we ordinarily call Filipinos, even there there is that distinction made among themselves. In speaking of themselves they say "such a man is a Moro" and "such a man is a Filipino." I am glad of the opportunity to draw the



distinction to which the Senator from Indiana has attracted my attention. I am very much obliged to him that he has done so, because I do not wish to be misunderstood in regard to that matter.

But, Mr. President, in speaking thus of the Filipinos, I do not say this with any disposition of criticism or controversy, but simply in connection with the contention which I am endeavoring to make as to the propriety of our conferring upon those people liberal free institutions. The fact that they are a Christian people, a people devoted in their observances of the requirements of the Christian religion, a people whose Christianity has developed into the observances of the outward decencies and modesties of life, a people whose Christianity has developed into the virtues of home and society which characterize Europeans and Americans who are also Christians—all these things, I say, Mr. President, should appeal to us most strongly in dealing with this people and influence us to confer upon them the freest institutions which it is possible for us to conceive them capable of appreciating and enjoying.

It does seem to me the very irony of fate—one that can not fail to sadden any man who goes there and looks upon that people—the very irony of fate that the people who alone in all Asia who share with us our religion and worship with us at the same altar; the people who alone in all Asia have, through the influence of our religion, grown into the love of the social and domestic virtues, which are our richest inheritance; the people who have come nearest to us in our civilization, so far as personal characteristics and observances go; the people among whom this is seen even in the matter of their dress, which closely approaches that of Europeans and Americans, the only people who in all Asia even approximate the outward dress of civilized nations—I say it seems to me to look like the irony of fate that we, the great Christian Republic of all the world, should have been brought into a situation—not criticising it now, but speaking of it simply as an unfortunate fact—that we should have been brought into a situation where there should have been between us this bloodshed, this terrible war, with its death and desolation and devastation. Mr. President, they are too far away, they belong to a different race, they can never be with us and a part of us, but every good sentiment appeals for their right to be a people, a nation free from yoke or thralldom.

Mr. President, I have felt that it was proper I should say this much for this people. I am not speaking now, as I say, in a controversial spirit or in a spirit of criticism for the purpose of attacking anything that has been done or anybody by whom it has been done. It is a very difficult thing in the heat of war and in the presence of the narration of outrages committed by some of that people upon our own soldiers, of barbarities and atrocities that nobody can possibly defend and everybody must condemn, and which I know the good people of that country condemn, it is extremely difficult for us to recognize the humanities of the situation; and it is with the hope that some one word I say may reach the American people in the presentation to them of the fact that, in spite of the horrors of war, in spite of all the prejudices which grow out of this conflict of life and death between man and man, and between people and people, in spite of all that, that they are a people who should peculiarly commend themselves to us; that they are the only people in the whole of Asia that have the same religion that we have; that they are the only people in Asia that have the same outward regard for the decencies of life and modesties that we have and as we understand, and that they are the only people who have and prize the same social and domestic virtues that we have.

I do not mean to say that other Asiatic nations have not the domestic virtues—far from it, because that would not be true, and it would be unkind in me to state it if it were true—but I say the peculiar social and domestic virtues, those that we most value and that peculiarly appeal to us, they are the virtues that strikingly distinguish the Filipino people from all other Asiatic people. And most deeply impressed, sir, as I am by this fact, I am impelled to the utterance that these are things which should appeal to us most strongly to deal with this people in the kindest, the most considerate, the most indulgent possible manner.

Not only so, but they should appeal to us most strongly to recognize the fact that a people of such religion, a people of such social and domestic virtues, a people with a love of country, which I believe is as strong in them as in any people in all the world, if they desire their liberty, if they desire an independent nationality, these are facts that should appeal to us most strongly, and we should not turn to them a deaf ear either through greed for wealth, the pride of conquest, or the lust of dominion.

Mr. President, I will take the opportunity to say that I have avoided, as Senators know, speaking of any fact connected with either the civil or military administration which came to my knowledge in the Philippine Islands, because I am unwilling to be put into a position of testifying or of appearing to do so, I

have carefully avoided it, but, at the same time, it is not improper that I should speak of these general conditions.

There is one thing which appealed to me most pathetically in my intercourse with a great many people there. I take occasion to say that I had no intercourse with any except those who had recognized the sovereignty of the United States and were professedly loyal to it, who were not insurgents—certainly not actively engaged in insurrection. But a fact which came to my knowledge—and I know it not only came to my knowledge, but to that of a great many others, because I have heard American officers speak of it—was this: That one great apprehension of that people is that the occupation of those islands by the American people means the extermination of themselves as a people.

That is the grave apprehension of that people. It is with them an ever-present haunting fear. I myself do not think to the extent of their fear the apprehension well-founded. If the islands shall be exploited by Americans, I doubt not that the Filipinos will be pressed to the wall and that under such circumstances they will never be the governing class in their own country. But I do not think the apprehension of utter extermination is well-founded, solely for the reason that, on account of climatic conditions, the islands can never be inhabited by white people. If they could be inhabited by white people I believe our occupation would have the effect of the practical extermination in time of the native population.

Mr. President, I venture to narrate to the Senate a little incident which came within my personal knowledge. I have narrated it elsewhere, but it will not be out of place here, as illustrative of the feeling of the Filipino people and their desire for nationality—a desire which, I think, is as universal as it has ever been among a people.

In conversing with a man who was not a politician and had never been a soldier, who was a man of property, a man of business, and who deprecated the war and wished it to cease, and was extremely anxious to that end that the authority of the United States should be recognized and that there should be no resistance to it, but who still thought that the Filipino people were entitled to their nationality, he said to me in a very dramatic manner, speaking of the condition in which the sovereignty of the United States would leave the islands and the effect upon the political status of its people: "I am not a Spaniard; I am not an American; I am not a Filipino. What am I?" indicating the utter hopelessness in that man's mind of the status of himself and his people, that he was no longer a Spaniard, that he could never become an American, and that as nationality was denied to his race he was not even a Filipino.

In this connection, while it is a little out of order for me to say it, I think one great defect in the pending bill is that there is no provision in it—at least there is not unless it has been made by amendment—under which any Filipino can ever become a citizen of the United States even if he comes to America.

Mr. President, I did not expect to make this statement relative to the Filipinos when I rose. I rose principally for the purpose of putting these documents in the RECORD in order that they might be preserved in some degree of continuity as a part of this debate, and unconsciously I have drifted into this. But, sir, now that I have said I do not regret it, and I would that I could say more, for my heart is heavy with the fate of that unhappy people. I do feel that no man can go to the Philippine Islands, unless he is an extreme partisan, and fail to be interested in that people and to entertain a very great desire that there should be meted out to them much of kindness and much of indulgence and much of consideration, and that above all there should be remembered the extreme desire and anxiety of that people for an independent nationality. I would that to-day we might set their feet in the path that shall lead to it.

Mr. CULBERSON. I wish formally to offer an amendment. By request I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill, and I ask that it may be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. ALLISON. I did not quite gather the purport of the paper presented by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. I presented, by request, an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I asked that it be printed so that we may have it on our desks to-morrow morning.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to that course, but if it is not too long it might be well to read it so that we might meditate upon it. I will not ask its reading, however, if it is very long.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is fairly lengthy.

Mr. ALLISON. I will not ask for its reading.

Mr. CULBERSON. Unless it is insisted upon, I think it had better not be read.

Mr. MCOMAS. I will ask the Senator whether it is mate-

rially different from the substitute pending or whether it contains only some small alteration.

Mr. CULBERSON. There is some difference between the two. I would not undertake to say how much or the character of the difference.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] referred to some remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] the other day in regard to the condition of the people of the Philippine Islands. The other night I had occasion to refer to some statements of Mr. Sixto Lopez in regard to that matter, and I failed at the time to ask the permission of the Senate to have them inserted as a part of my remarks. I wish now to ask unanimous consent to print this statement, which I have obtained from Mr. Sixto Lopez, in regard to affairs and conditions in the Philippine Islands, languages, etc., as an appendix to my remarks made the other night, instead of putting me to the trouble of reading it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut). The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print a statement—

Mr. CARMACK. It is a reply to some questions propounded by myself to Mr. Sixto Lopez in regard to affairs and conditions in the Philippine Islands, and especially with regard to the character of the people and the difference of language and everything of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that—

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Maryland permit the Chair to state the request?

Mr. McCOMAS. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the statement of Sixto Lopez, in reply to questions propounded by the Senator from Tennessee, may be incorporated in the RECORD without being read.

Mr. McCOMAS. I dislike to make objection to a request of the Senator from Tennessee to print anything as an appendix to his remarks, but, as he has now stated, this is a statement made by Mr. Lopez, who has not been in the islands for a very long while, and that it is a series of answers, as I understand, to a series of questions propounded by the Senator from Tennessee, who is himself a member of our committee, I think objection should be made. Of course the Senator does that which he thinks is his duty, but as the committee has not heard and probably will not hear this witness, it seems to me the interrogation of this witness on the subject-matter of the investigation, presented by a member of the committee, had better not go into the RECORD.

Mr. CARMACK. I did not understand the last remark of the Senator.

Mr. McCOMAS. The Senator himself is a very busy member of the Committee on the Philippines, and he says it is a series of questions propounded by himself to this person.

Mr. CARMACK. Yes.

Mr. McCOMAS. I question very much whether it ought to go in as an appendix to his speech. Is it long?

Mr. CARMACK. It is a matter of no consequence. I will get it into the RECORD, just the same. It will merely put me to the trouble of reading it. I have sent to my secretary at the office for it, and will get it in a few moments and will personally read it to the Senate. I do not care. If I had it here I would rather read it than merely to have it printed. Objection being made, I will take the first opportunity to read it. I think the Senator ought to hear it, anyway.

I will say to the Senator that I was one of those who insisted that Mr. Lopez and others ought to be brought here to testify before the committee. He has been persistently attacked by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. They have brought witnesses from the Philippine Islands; one witness is here now, brought all the way. He was in the service of Aguinaldo, and quit his service in order to take service with the United States. He has been brought all the way from the Philippines to testify before the committee, after the committee has persistently refused to hear the testimony of anybody on the other side, even where the witnesses were here. In this case there is a man of unusual intelligence—

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the Senator permit me for a moment?

Mr. CARMACK. A man of high education and culture. I did propound questions to him, and I do intend to have his testimony put into the RECORD, although the committee is determined that it shall not be heard by the committee.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the Senator state the name of the witness who has been brought here by the committee from the Philippine Islands?

Mr. CARMACK. I say he has been brought here. I do not know that he was brought here by the committee.

Mr. McCOMAS. Brought by whom?

Mr. CARMACK. For the purpose of testifying. I refer to Buencamino.

Mr. McCOMAS. Brought by whom?

Mr. CARMACK. I do not know that he was brought here. He is here.

Mr. LODGE. He has come here at his own expense, because he is placing his sons at college in this country.

Mr. CARMACK. My impression is that he stated before the House committee that he came here at the expense of the Federal party, which is simply an adjunct of the Philippine Commission.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then I understand—

Mr. LODGE. He has not been called by our committee.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then, I understand, the Senator from Tennessee did not say he was brought here by the committee?

Mr. CARMACK. No; I said he had been brought here—brought here for the purposes of the committee.

Mr. McCOMAS. It now appears that he was brought here by himself, being of age.

Mr. CARMACK. It may so appear to the Senator from Maryland. It does not so appear to me.

Mr. McCOMAS. He will say when he appears how he came here; and if he came at the request of the Federal party, he came under his rights.

Mr. CARMACK. Oh, well; I suppose so. There is no law to keep him from coming. All right, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee insist upon his request?

Mr. CARMACK. I do. I make the request, and let them object to it if they want to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the statement prepared by Sixto Lopez in response to questions propounded to him by the Senator from Tennessee may be put into the RECORD without being read. Is there objection?

Mr. McCOMAS. Since this statement—

Mr. CARMACK. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment, I wish to have it printed as an appendix to my remarks delivered the other evening. I will say that it was a matter of forgetfulness on my part at the time that the statement was not read and put into the RECORD. I had it there for that very purpose; but I found I had consumed a little over two hours, that I was very tired and very unwell, and I stopped very suddenly in my speech. I remembered a minute afterwards, when it was too late, that I had forgotten to use this document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CARMACK. My speech has not yet been printed.

Mr. McCOMAS. This appears to be the submission to Lopez by a member of the committee of a series of interrogations answered without cross-examination, and I am inclined to think I ought to continue to object to the printing of that as an appendix which appears to be an examination and is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CARMACK. Very well; I will get it into the RECORD in some way, I suppose. So far as concerns the statement of the Senator from Maryland that there is no cross-examination, I will say that that is the fault of the Senator and of those who are associated with him, who have determined not to permit this witness to testify because they believe he will bring forth statements of facts which they do not wish to hear. They could very easily have the opportunity to cross-examine this witness if they wish to do so. The only reason why they have had no opportunity to cross-examine him is that they have refused to permit him to come before the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. McCOMAS. If one thing be true, perhaps I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. CARMACK. I have not yielded to the Senator from Maryland. What did the Senator say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCOMAS. Did the Senator ask in his questions whether Lopez was or was not a member of the Hongkong junta?

Mr. CARMACK. I did, and he said he was not.

Mr. McCOMAS. And had not been?

Mr. CARMACK. My impression is he said he had never been. I will not say positively, but my impression is that he said he was not. I know he said he is not a member of the Hongkong junta; and, more than that, he said he was opposed to war between the United States and the Philippine Islands, although he was entirely in sympathy with the aspirations of his people for independence.

Mr. McCOMAS. The Senator says, "I think." If the Senator means to tell me he is quite clear in his recollection that this man said that he was not and had not been a member of the Hongkong junta, I would want to withdraw my objection.



Mr. CARMACK. The paper will show for itself. The Senator means to imply that if he were a member of the Hongkong junta he would not be worthy of belief. I suppose the inference is that he would tell a lie about it. So his statement would not relieve the matter from his view.

Mr. McCOMAS. I would not want a man, who is plotting and planning insurrection against the United States, against American soldiers—

Mr. CARMACK. If the Senator is willing to take his word—

Mr. McCOMAS. If the Senator says the man was not a member of the junta, that would be on the face of it a reason to induce me to withdraw my objection.

Mr. CARMACK. He does say he is not a member.

Mr. McCOMAS. And has not been?

Mr. CARMACK. I will not be positive on the point that he never was. The impression made upon my mind was that he was not a member of the Hongkong junta at any time. I am not sure about it.

Mr. McCOMAS. Let the Senator get his paper, and if that appears I will withdraw my objection, perhaps.

Mr. CARMACK. I will get it into the RECORD anyhow, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CARMACK. There is one other matter which I wish to present. I have probably about consumed my time, though.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has three or four minutes remaining.

Mr. CARMACK. I wish to speak briefly to the amendment I offered, which I should like to have read. The amendment is to come in at the end of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. Before we pass from the matter just up, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. CARMACK. With pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to make an appeal to my honorable friend the Senator from Maryland, and I would make the appeal if I were zealously in favor of all the opinions he so honestly and so zealously entertains about the pending matter. I have repeatedly made a like appeal, and it has very generally been yielded to, in regard to subjects where I had no sympathy with the matter sought to be introduced.

As I understand it, a member of the Senate says he intended to add to his speech a statement of certain opinions made by a person whose opinion he thought of value, and that he forgot it, being fatigued, and he now desires to supply the omission which he made under those circumstances, when he was in a state of illness, by adding in the RECORD to his speech what he had a perfect right to put in and what nobody would have thought of considering improper, from his point of view, to put in. That is the request.

Mr. President, where any single Senator, representing his State, of course, says that a newspaper or other article on current politics, on the tariff, on any question of finance, or currency, or the homestead law, or anything else is important enough to have printed, instead of requiring him to read it, as he has a right to do, we have been accustomed to let him print it, always as a document, and very frequently in the RECORD. It saves us a great deal of tedious time in debate, and it also keeps or tends to keep our debates good-natured. I am glad to know they are in general, at least.

Now, I ask my honorable friend whether, considering those circumstances (I do not say anything about the right of the Senator from Tennessee to get up and have it read), he will not withdraw his objection. It would take a half hour, and we should have to remain here and listen to it. I can vouch myself for the fact that Sixto Lopez is a very intelligent man, a man whose opinions and arguments, even if they do not convince anybody, the Senator would like to consider as a strong statement on the other side. I desire to appeal to my honorable friend from Maryland whether, under the circumstances, it would not be best, not so much with reference to the pending matter, but as a general practice and habit of the Senate, to let such a request be granted.

Mr. McCOMAS. I think the Senator from Tennessee has been quite frank about this matter, and his last statement, I said, was quite pertinent to the removal of my objection. Sixto Lopez has, in my belief, been a member of the Hongkong junta: I do not know, but that has been my sincere impression based upon circumstances. If he has been and has been secretly raising money and making efforts to wage war against our Army and our flag, it has seemed to me, since the effort was made frankly and openly to have him examined before the committee, that at this time, when we are waiting, because of the failure of explosive utterances, and since the Senator from Tennessee has examined this witness *ex parte*—of course according to his view of his duty in the matter—and since the testimony was not taken before the

committee and the witness has not been cross-examined, it would be well that at least a part of the testimony be read.

The Senator has said that when the paper is produced he thinks it will appear that the witness has said he never was a member of this treasonable organization against our flag and our Army. The bias of a witness is an important matter. There are witnesses who testify, whose testimony is shadowed, colored, and made of no account by the bias of their position, their motive, or their enmity. Now, in this case I should be glad to hear these things, and I have already said that when the Senator from Tennessee refreshes his mind and finds out, as he may, that this man disclaims all connection at any time with that organization, then I expect to withdraw my objection.

The Senator says he will send for the paper, and when that is done, if that appears, my objection will be withdrawn, because I shall have very great anxiety and earnestness to find out whether that statement be a true statement, because if it be not true all the statements must stand together or fall together. So the Senator from Massachusetts need not make the appeal. The Senator from Tennessee has already made a statement which will, when he so finds the fact, remove my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CARMACK. So far as that is concerned—

Mr. McCOMAS. I will take the floor and yield it to the Senator from Tennessee, inasmuch as I have consumed his time, if I can do so.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can not.

Mr. CARMACK. I rose first to make a request, and I rise now to discuss the amendment. Am I recognized for that purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Tennessee under the circumstances.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, so far as the other matter is concerned, when I read the statement of Sixto Lopez I will read it all, and I will read it in my own right. The Senator from Maryland has simply put me to a little extra trouble; that is all. It is not a question of Sixto Lopez or his character, but of ordinary courtesy to a Senator, when I said to the Senator that I had the statement before me the other night for the purpose of reading it, but, being very tired, had suspended my remarks. I forgot to read it when I could have done so without asking permission of him or anybody else.

Mr. President, I ask the Secretary to read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert the following:

That the United States regard with extreme disfavor any movement having for its object the early or ultimate admission of the Philippine Islands as a State or States of the Union; and any action on the part of persons holding office under the authority of the United States that gives sanction or encouragement to such movement is hereby condemned.

That to confer the rights and privileges of citizens upon the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands would tend to destroy the integrity of the citizenship and to degrade the character of the Government of the United States.

That to maintain the relation of sovereign and subject between the Government of the United States and a people under its dominion would be repugnant to the principles of the Constitution.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, this amendment, it seems to me, is of considerable importance, in view of the relations existing between the Philippine government and the Government of the United States and what is called the Federal party in the Philippine Islands. This party took its name as an indication of its purpose—the Federal party; a party of federation; of federation with United States, which is one of the declared purposes of the party. In the history of the Federal party, written by native members of the Philippine Commission, it is declared that that is the purpose of the Federal party. The three native members of the Philippine Commission, the three associates of Governor Taft, and the other American members of the Commission openly declare that their purpose and desire is to obtain statehood in the American Union, and when Governor Taft was before the committee I myself put the question to him as to whether or not he believed that eight or ten million Malays should be incorporated into the body of our citizenship and a Malay archipelago admitted to statehood in the American Union. His answer was that it was a question which at that time he could not answer either yes or no.

Now, Mr. President, we have had here, brought by Governor Taft, laid before the Senate and before the Congress of the United States, the memorial of this Federal party, in which they expressly declare that "We reject everything which tends to a colony," and they declare that "to make of the Philippines a colony of the United States would be to hand the islands over to disorder and to anarchy, to destruction, and to chaos."

This Federal party is opposed to the independence of the Philippine Islands. The three leaders of the party are members of the Philippine Commission. They demand annexation to the

United States. They demand citizenship in the United States. They demand that their country shall first be organized as a Territory with full constitutional rights to all of the people, and then admission to statehood in the Union.

I asked the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to whether or not he was in favor of that part of the amendment declaring against statehood in the American Union. He said that he would answer at some time or other, but the time has not come.

Now, in view of the fact that these declarations have been made on the part of the men who are closely associated with our own Government in the Philippine Islands, that this Federal party is the open and avowed agency of the Philippine government in conducting their campaign to bring the people to the support of American sovereignty, and that it has been through this party, as Governor Taft himself declared, that more has been accomplished in pacifying the people than by all the armies in the field, it becomes a matter of great importance to know whether those who are representing the Government and the Administration and the party in power are in sympathy with this movement of the Federal party.

Gen. Luke E. Wright, the acting head of the Philippine government in the absence of Governor Taft, made some very significant remarks upon this very question, as quoted in the Manila Times on February 24. The speech of Governor Wright was made on the 22d day of February, Washington's birthday, before a meeting of the Federal party, and in that speech he said:

It is especially gratifying to all Americans that the Filipinos of the Federal party have begun to realize the generous intentions of the American people; that they are beginning to understand that America has not invaded these islands in order to deprive the inhabitants of their rights or to make them political slaves [great cheers], but that the purpose of the American people, if they were permitted to do so, was to establish here their same altars on which shall be lighted the fires of liberty which exist in America, at which all can worship. Any other policies would be both shortsighted and contrary to all the glorious traditions of the American people; they would give a lie to the American principles which Washington gave, and debase all he taught as a delusion and a snare. We have become great and prosperous by adherence to his teachings. Whatever differences may have existed among the American people in principles as to holding these islands, there never has been a doubt that Filipinos would not in time enjoy the same liberties and become part of our nation. [Loud cheering.]

It is because the American authorities believe in the patriotic purpose of the Federal party, because they believe the party understands and appreciates the intentions of America, that they extend the right hand of fellowship to it. It is welcomed into the field because the policy it announces is in accordance with American principles.

And again:

It is true that you will not be aiding in the establishment of a weak and nerveless government which will be a prey to desire for more powerful powers and a prey to personal ambitions, but you will be engaged in preparing yourselves to be worthy of citizenship in the great American Republic. [Great cheers.]

There is an express indorsement by an American member of the Philippine Commission, the acting head of the Philippine Commission, of the platform and declaration of purposes of the Federal party, which includes citizenship, the incorporation of all the Filipinos into citizenship in the United States, with the promise of admission to statehood in the American Union.

I say under the circumstances, when men so close to the Administration, men in the confidence of the Administration, can make these open and public declarations, practically promising the people of the Philippine Islands that they shall be given American citizenship, and that their country shall be admitted to statehood in the American Union, it becomes a matter of duty for the party in power, holding every branch of this Government, to make a declaration of its purposes; not to make a declaration to the Filipinos, but to make a declaration to the American people as to whether or not it intends that 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 Malays 10,000 miles from our seat of Government shall be incorporated into the body of our citizenship, and as to whether a Malay archipelago 10,000 miles away shall be admitted to statehood in the American Union.

During Mr. CARMACK'S speech, the President pro tempore resumed the chair.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I have not thought it worth while until the very last to say a word in answer to the various charges and innuendoes against our army in the Philippines. In fact, Mr. President, the worse the charges the better I have been pleased, for the quicker will come the refutation and the stronger the reaction which is sure to follow in the minds of the people. In fact, Mr. President, the Army represents, as it always has, the very best sentiment and opinion of the people. Our military and naval organizations make them legally perpetuated, continuous bodies, never expiring, and therefore retaining their principles and character more than any other bodies of men. The highly educated and trained officers of our Army hand down from one generation to another the unwritten laws, customs, and traditions which have controlled the Army from the first.

The personality, teachings, and spirit of Washington, Steuben, and Greene, of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan animate and inspire it still. It has the same high sense of honor and justice, the same respect for law, the same spirit of kindness to the defeated enemy and to whatever wards the fortunes of war have thrown into its keeping. It is the same Army, Mr. President, that has shed its blood from Quebec to the City of Mexico, from Bunker Hill, Brandywine, and Yorktown to the Pacific, at Vicksburg, Gettysburg, and in the Antilles, on the Asiatic main, and now in the islands of the East. It has twice fought with our parent stock, and once, in the greatest of all wars, with our own brethren of the South. I may fairly say that it is the same Army that, divided against itself, under Lee and Jackson and the Johnstons, fought so bravely against its other half, for those gallant leaders were born of it and had long been a part of it. The men in this Chamber and elsewhere who served under those great captains will not traduce the character of the American Army. The very reason why it was the greatest of all wars was because it was an American army on both sides. It is the same Army, Mr. President, which, in burning homes, blazed its broad path under Sherman through South Carolina.

That was war, and only cruel because war is cruel. The great West, Mr. President—and in this I include the 19 States and 8 Territories west of the Mississippi River—owes a debt of untold magnitude to the Army of the United States.

It was our Army that made the settlement and civilization of the States represented by Senators in this discussion from Colorado and Idaho and Utah possible generations before it could otherwise have been; the same Army, Mr. President, that has fought the Indians on the plains and in the mountains of the West hundreds of times marching and fighting in the almost arctic cold of mountain winters and in the torrid heats of the plains in summer. It has suffered at the hands of its savage foes torture, massacre, and mutilation. It has sometimes inflicted terrible punishment in return. In these sudden and sharp conflicts Indian women and children have sometimes been killed. It could not be otherwise. But, Mr. President, how would it have been if those Indian wars had been carried on by the settlers, the constituents of my friends the Senators from Colorado and Idaho.

Which would show the more mercy, Mr. President, the border settlers or the Army? Who did the Indians learn to respect and trust, the border settlers or the Army? Who did they look to for protection and fair treatment in times of trouble and when their rights were invaded by the white man's greed for their lands? I make the assertion, Mr. President, without fear of contradiction, that there is no class of men in our country such true and consistent friends of the Indians as the officers of our Army who had to fight them. It was one of the trying duties of the Army to conduct the Indians when legislated from one reservation to another, when torn from their long-time homes and driven many times with their little belongings under the most trying circumstances hundreds of miles to strange lands and inhospitable climes.

Was the Army ever otherwise than kind and considerate in the performance of this sad duty, often sacrificing their own needs for the comfort and greater necessities of their wards? There was never a charge against them in this respect. The bravest are the tenderest, Mr. President, and our Army is as brave as ever and as true to the dictates of humanity. A few months' service in the Philippines has not entirely changed the character it has maintained for a century and a quarter. The people can not be made to believe that it has.

How would it be to-day, Mr. President, if the constituents of those Senators to whom I have referred were settling in the Philippines and had the same treacherous foes to encounter? What would be the story of cruelty and outrage, and would those Senators have been attacking or apologizing for it? It is the same Army, Mr. President, which was noted above all the other contingents in China for its good order, kind treatment of the people, and restraint from looting. The opportunity and provocation for cruelty and rapine was as great in China as in the Philippines. Did the Army change so suddenly from bad to good and on its return from the Philippines back to worse in a few weeks?

Mr. President, there are some things that the officers of our Army can surely be counted on to do, and some not to do, at all times and under all conditions. They will fight when it is their duty to. They will not lie or steal. They will be as generous and humane to their foes as they have ever been. Our Army will, as I have said it always has been, be true to the best sentiment of our people and be the same brave, loyal, honorable, and humane body it has always been. All honor, I say, Mr. President, to the American Army.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, Felipe Buencamino has lately arrived in the United States and is heralded as coming here for the purpose of declaring his admiration of the American Government and his earnest desire that the purpose of the Administration to conquer and hold the Philippine Islands shall succeed;



and he was hastened before one of the committees of Congress to give his testimony along that line.

Now, whether he came here at his own expense or was brought here by the Government or came as a representative of the Federal party is of little moment. What I want to do is to read to the Senate an address that was made by Felipe Buencamino to the Congress of the United States in the month of August, 1899, at a time when he had charge of the foreign portfolio of Aguinaldo's government. This address is simply signed by himself, as follows:

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, yours, very respectfully,  
FELIPE BUENCAMINO.

It is really a very interesting document.

After reading for some time—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. Mr. PATTERSON. I ask unanimous consent to publish the entire document as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as part of his remarks the remainder of the document from which he has been reading. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

The document above referred to is as follows:

[Official translation.]

To the honorable the members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The government of the Philippine republic being informed that it is the intention of the President of the United States to convene a meeting of the honorable members of Congress at a comparatively early date for the purpose of discussing and passing a resolution having for its object a just decision as to the policy to be pursued in reference to the present situation in the Philippines, I believe it to be consistent with the dictates of courtesy, as well as a duty to humanity, that, in view of the fact that I have been intrusted with the portfolio of foreign affairs, I should respectfully submit this document to you, setting forth the aspirations of the Filipino people and their reasons and justification for wishing to be recognized by your influential Government as an independent state.

Allow me, gentlemen, to lay before you for your distinguished consideration the facts and rights that form the grounds upon which the claim for recognition is made and sustained.

#### FIRST.

It is generally accepted as an axiom that as regards international affairs the larger and more powerful a state the greater is the obligation morally to support and maintain lesser states in the independence, the welfare, and the happiness with which God in his bountiful goodness has designed should be theirs, and of which the greater states are guardians.

For instance, it appears evident that the powerful and wealthy nation which you, gentlemen, represent in Congress has been deputed by God to assist the weak Filipinos in the arduous and difficult task of restoration of their independence.

Eloquent proof of this is to be found in the cooperation offered and rendered to Don Emilio Aguinaldo in May, 1898, by the United States consuls at Hongkong and Singapore (Mr. Rounseville Wildman and Mr. E. Spencer Pratt) in order that our illustrious leader might continue the revolutionary war waged against Spain in 1896 and 1897, hostilities in connection with which were suspended under the provisions of the compact of Biac-na-bato.

The cooperation referred to consisted of the facts: That the U. S. dispatch boat *McCulloch*, attached to Admiral Dewey's squadron, conveyed Don Emilio Aguinaldo from Hongkong to Cavite, where he arrived on the 19th May, 1898; that Admiral Dewey received Don Emilio Aguinaldo with the ceremony and honors due to a general, in the presence of the whole of the officers and men of the flagship *Olympia*, and, besides, gave him 60 Spanish Mauser rifles to aid in a renewal of the revolution against Spain; that Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo was allowed to establish in Cavite, which was then held by the United States naval forces, the headquarters of the Filipino government, which commenced to exercise the functions of government on the 24th May, 1898, issuing therefrom a proclamation declaring war against Spain to wrest from her our independence. (Proclamation attached hereto.)

The letters of the aforesaid consuls, which are attached hereto for the information of the free and enlightened citizens of the United States, confirm the above statements.

Mr. Pratt, in one of his letters, says he congratulates himself on the rapid triumphs of Don Emilio Aguinaldo over the Spaniards, as it proves the wisdom of his judgment in recommending him to Admiral (then Commodore) Dewey and the Government at Washington, and he added that he hoped to receive, when General Aguinaldo captured Manila, some historic memento of the place and of the incident, such as the flag or keys of the city or principal fortress.

Consul-General Wildman, of Hongkong, instructed Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, in a letter attached hereto, respecting the treatment of Spanish prisoners, advising General Aguinaldo to give them only rice and water and treat the Spaniards "as they would treat you," advice which our humane leader declined to accept and act upon.

Thus, in this wholly unexpected and unforeseen way, bonds of good will and friendship were formed between Americans and Filipinos, resulting, as is well known, in the heroic and triumphant campaign of the Filipino army against the Spaniards, though it must be admitted, with due regard for the truth, that after the above-mentioned assistance and cordial cooperation, our army received no more aid from the high officers of the United States, the Filipino army thereafter prosecuting the war against the Spanish land forces independently of any authority other than that exercised by our successful and brave leader, Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo, who, while directing the military operations with well-nigh miraculous skill and startling results, was also engaged in the task of organizing the Filipino national government on the model of Western nations, which are, admittedly, founders and leaders of modern civilization.

Thus it is plain that it was through providential agencies that the Filipino state came into being on the 24th day of May, 1898, and has existed to this day, replacing the alien Spanish Government, which fell definitely on the 13th day of August, 1898, on which day our troops, which, in fact, and as set forth in Consul-General Pratt's letters, had closely invested Manila for more than two months, captured the suburbs of Manila, driving the Spaniards from their defenses, while the United States forces peacefully occupied the walled city in accordance with the terms of capitulation signed by the Spanish general.

It would seem, therefore, that there can be no doubt that God, in His in-

finite goodness, wisdom, and mercy, intrusted to the honor of the United States the liberation and independence of the Filipinos; but notwithstanding the evidence that the hand of Providence has guided the course of events, the United States are now endeavoring to prevent the consummation of the glorious and just purposes of the Creator. By whom, by what agency, were the two peoples united in the bonds of sympathy and friendship? Who could have prevented it?

Who is it that has caused these two friends and brethren to wage war upon one another? Alas, esteemed citizens of the great American Republic, you know well who is the cause of such reckless perturbation. It is the President of your Republic, Mr. William McKinley, who, using as a pretext alleged rights obtained through the purchase of the more than doubtful sovereignty of Spain, gives evidence of his intention to ignore the bonds of friendship and guardianship which should unite the two nations by imposing on us by force of arms the sovereignty of the United States. Is this line of conduct of Mr. McKinley in harmony with the canons of morality simply because the American nation is greater, more opulent, and more powerful than the Filipinos? Surely it is not, for if moral obligations, which bind parties to respect the generally accepted codes of morality, are applicable in international affairs it is beyond question that there should be no evasion of obligation on the part of the great American nation to stand by and protect the small Filipino nation until the great work of securing the recognition of our existence as an independent nation is recognized and thereby firmly established—a great work to which your consuls (above mentioned) and commanders unquestionably and providentially applied themselves.

In the name, therefore, of Almighty God, of humanity, and of national honor, I now appeal to the great and influential citizens of the United States to fulfill these obligations by passing, as a matter of paramount importance, a just resolution in your national Congress officially recognizing our independence, thereby bringing to an end this inhuman and wicked war and restoring the reign of peace and harmony between Americans and Filipinos, who, in accordance with the infallible will of God, should live under the happy conditions of brotherhood.

#### SECOND.

Accomplished facts are accepted in dealing with things political as rights unless the facts are at variance with the doctrines laid down in international law or the eternal principles of justice. Strictly in accordance with these incontrovertible principles the independence of the United States was realized and recognized in the last century.

In the same manner, and in more recent times, the Kingdom of Italy and the German Empire have come into existence, the ruling principle being, and the reason of it, that all men are born equal and possess inalienable rights of life, liberty, independence, and freedom in the pursuit of happiness.

Now, it is indisputable that we, the Filipinos, defeated the Spaniards, capturing 9,000 prisoners, and set up a republican government in the place of the one which had been vanquished. It is also beyond question that these accomplished facts have been recognized in a practical manner by the high officers who at that time, and since then, represented the United States in this archipelago, which is proved by the correspondence of our leader with Admiral (then Commodore) Dewey and Generals Anderson, Merritt, and Otis, copies of which are attached hereto for the information of the citizens of the United States.

It is to be observed, in the first place, that in his first letter to Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo Admiral Dewey states that he has received, with pleasure, the documents forwarded to him by our distinguished leader, promising to transmit them to their respective destinations. The documents referred to are the first proclamation issued by Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo, announcing his arrival and the establishment of the dictatorial government at Cavite; also the proclamation of Philippine independence, issued in the town of Cavite in the province of the same name; some to be forwarded to the United States Government in Washington and others to be forwarded to the representatives of the powers in Manila.

Secondly, it is to be noted that the Admiral, in another letter, asks General Aguinaldo for passports for several gentlemen recommended by the British consul, who was also acting consul for the United States of America in Manila, to enable them to travel freely and safely through our territory.

And, finally, it is noteworthy that Generals Anderson, Merritt, and Otis, in their correspondence, styled—as was only right and proper that they should—our leader "general commanding the Philippine revolutionary army," while General Anderson asked Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo for quarters and camping ground for the forces under his command, as well as other assistance and cooperation in the campaign against the Spaniards, our "common enemy." It is also a well-known fact that the American commanders applied to us for positions and trenches for their troops in Maytag, so as to place their forces side by side with our troops in the siege of Manila. In fact, the records prove that everything was done in a manner that indicated full recognition of our triumphant revolution and the noble ends kept constantly in view, namely, our liberty and independence, and owing to which (the righteousness of our cause) the new Filipino state, by its just and irrefragable procedure, unquestionably merited the consideration and respect of the American commanders.

This explains how Admiral Dewey submitted for the disposition of Gen. Emilio Aguinaldo a protest lodged by the French consul in respect of the capture of the steamer *Compania de Filipinas*, which had been seized by us, the Admiral stating positively that he and his forces had nothing to do with the affair; held no jurisdiction in the premises.

In the light of the correspondence, it is readily understood how Generals Anderson and Merritt came to address telegrams to Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo on the 13th August, 1898 (the day on which our troops captured the whole of the suburbs of Manila and the Spaniards in the walled city capitulated to the forces of the United States), requesting General Aguinaldo to give instructions for his troops to evacuate the suburbs in order to avoid the dangers inseparable from a dual military occupation, and offering to negotiate with General Aguinaldo afterwards.

Lastly, it is quite comprehensible how General Otis came to appeal to General Aguinaldo in the name of the United States Government for the release of the friars held by us as prisoners—acts which show in an eloquent manner distinct recognition of the sovereign power and authority of the Philippine people, which had been recovered from the Spaniards since then and reassumed in the exalted and worthy personality of our leader, Gen. Don Emilio Aguinaldo.

Viewed from another standpoint, the above-mentioned incidents might be held to indicate that they were clear evidence that it was the bounden duty of the American commanders to harass and if possible quell the Philippine revolution, not convey our illustrious leader to Cavite to begin with, and thereby afford him very favorable opportunity (in view of the mode of conveyance, his reception by the Admiral, and the permission granted him to establish his headquarters in Cavite whence he issued, without protest of any kind by Admiral Dewey or anyone else, a proclamation calling on the people to rally round his standard and wage war upon Spain to wrest from her the sovereignty of the archipelago) to revive the revolution against Spain, using his prestige and exercising his authority and genius to that end. But far from being indiscreet or ill-considered action, the recognition of General Aguinaldo's power and prestige, the arrangement to bring him



back to the Philippines, the courtesy extended to him by Admiral Dewey, and the conduct of your consuls and generals was, on the contrary, rightful recognition of our revolution, in that our sovereign rights and independent authority in the archipelago was practically conceded and accepted as accomplished facts. It is therefore evident that we have a perfect right, and are not straining any points, in demanding from the Government of Washington official recognition of our independence, basing the demand on the above-mentioned reason that accomplished facts in affairs political constitute right.

This is altogether apart from and does not clash with the victories of your troops over the Spaniards, nor the cession of sovereignty by Spain in the treaty of Paris of the 10th December last in favor of the United States.

As regards your victories, there are the proclamations of General Merritt and the letters of General Anderson, clearly setting forth that America did not come to the Philippines to make conquests, much less to wage war against the natives, but to free the people from the galling yoke of Spain. "We came not as enemies, but as liberators." Such were the solemn pledges of your Generals Merritt and Anderson to the Filipinos when they arrived in these islands.

Therefore it is plain that it can not be claimed that by reason of your victories over the Spaniards rights of conquest accrue to you as being due from the Filipinos for the all-sufficient reason that you were not engaged in war with us between the 1st May, 1898, and the 4th February, 1899, during the night of which latter date your forces, in accordance with the orders of President William McKinley, commenced hostilities against our forces for the purpose of establishing American sovereignty in our archipelago by force of arms.

As for the cession of sovereignty, I have to say it is a null and void agreement in every respect, for it has been celebrated in contravention of all rules of international law and in opposition to the eternal principles of justice.

For example: It is not moral, nor could it be just, and much less is it in accord with international right to say to a nation: "I will help you to sweep away Spanish sovereignty and make you independent, and after helping you to sweep away and destroy the said sovereignty, I come and buy the sovereignty from Spain by title of cession and impose it by force of arms upon the protected people."

Such a proceeding is self-condemnatory, for its accomplishment rests only with arbitrary power and in the power of any one exercising such power and carrying it to the extent of injuring an ally or a friend to whom protection is offered. Fiore, Bluntschli, and Haller, authorities on international right, established as a rule to be universally applied, the following: "It is not just, under the pretext of assumed laws of nations, to amalgamate or segregate a people against their obvious will, spontaneously and voluntarily acclaimed."

Therefore the cession in question is an act completely null and void, being neither moral nor just; nor is it even licit according to international law.

On the other hand, in respect of cessions the essential conditions include the possession of what is ceded, and when it concerns inhabited territories the concordance and express consent of the inhabitants is necessary. Neither of these conditions have been fulfilled in respect of the cession of the Philippines by the treaty of Paris of the 10th December, 1898. First, because at that date, and long before it, Spain exercised no sovereignty whatever over any Philippine territory, which was reconquered by us, and governed by us since June, 1898, which facts were well known to the Governments of Washington and Madrid. Second, because the Philippine people had publicly and loyally manifested to the Government of Washington and to the whole world that it was their desire to live independently of all alien sovereignty, and perhaps on this account our wishes were not consulted when the cession was made—an act, without doubt, of bad faith on the part of the two contracting parties, who were perforce obliged to make the terms null and void by reason of this false step.

Consequently the treaty of Paris of 10th December, 1898, does not convey any sovereign rights whatever in favor of the United States over any of the Philippine Islands or its inhabitants. Nor are the United States in any way entitled by it to impose upon the Philippine people an alien sovereignty by force of arms.

The United States, therefore, can not be excused from recognizing our independence either on account of their victories over the Spaniards or by reason of the provisions of the treaty of Paris. We, however, readily admit that our gratitude and full recognition are due to the great North American nation for the generous assistance proffered us by their consular representatives and commanders in bringing from Hongkong to Cavite our illustrious leader to continue the rebellion against Spain, and then, by respecting that revolution, recognizing it as the sovereign power which replaced that which Spain had lost; but from the fact of oppressing us and endeavoring to flch from us our liberties, subjecting our independence, so dearly won, to the influence of a new foreign yoke there is a wide gulf fixed which is as limitless as the distance to another world, and the only possible way to accomplish your object is to destroy the lives of 8,000,000 Filipinos, an act which would leave on the hitherto spotless pages of your glorious history and traditional liberality an everlasting and indelible stain.

### THIRD.

The Filipinos can justly boast of a social status on a par with cultured peoples and are fit to commingle and live on an equality with civilized nations, forming in common with them part of the magna civitas.

We are a community of 8,000,000 people, politically organized on well-defined territory, with our own government, which is competent to and sufficient for the protection of the rights of our citizens and capable of assuming full responsibility for our acts in the conduct of relations with other States. We have an official language—Spanish. We have accepted an enlightened religion—the Roman Catholic faith. Strict morality, which emanates from Christianizing influences, governs our manners and customs. Our laws are on a par with statutes of other civilized States, being identical with those in operation in these islands during the last few years, which have been generally accepted as meeting the requirements of civilized communities; and, lastly, we live in families, in towns, and in cities, affording permanent evidence of a status of cultured and civilized society, it being universally conceded that the Philippines, unlike other Far Eastern States, have invariably extended hospitality to all foreigners and enjoy the reputation of exceptional faultlessness and the strongest aversion to anything in the nature of barbarous conduct.

We, the Filipinos, respect life, honor, and rights in property, and punish with severe penalties all violations of these governing principles of humanity. We also have laws encouraging the knowledge of science and arts, protecting industries, commerce, and agriculture, and we profess, finally, our acquaintance with all the most noble sentiments of friendship, gratitude, and honesty.

We possess, therefore, all the conditions requisite for existence as an independent State according to article 37 of the International Code of the famous juriconsult Fiore, and that being so, we are perfectly justified in demanding from all the great civilized States official recognition of our independence in conformity with articles 44, 48, and 49 of the said standard work, which provides, moreover, that such recognition can not, under the circumstances, be denied us, nor should it be unduly delayed. It is clearly set forth in articles

55 and 56 of Fiore's work that any course of procedure in contravention of the foregoing articles is opposed to the principle of high policy.

To better prove to the people of the United States our culture and state of civilization there are annexed to this document copies of our fundamental laws and various decrees relating to the establishment of our executive and judicial administration, our educational establishments, and our army regulations. In this way perhaps the people of the States will be better able to grasp the truth respecting our advancement along the high road of modern civilization and be thereby convinced of our ability to rule and govern ourselves in an independent manner.

These are the reasons why we appeal for official recognition of our independence, reasons which we confidently submit to the deep conscientiousness of the enlightened people of the United States, a people destined by God to decide the fate of our unfortunate country, a fate which would be better if, heeding the dictates of justice and humanity, your President, Mr. McKinley, had not chosen to wage this cruel, devastating war against us with your powerful land and sea forces.

It is sometimes said that we are to blame for the outbreak of hostilities during the night of the 4th February last, but this is not an established fact.

In the first place, because we, the Filipinos, were expecting at that very time (the beginning of February) official recognition of our independence from the Government of Washington, an expectation which was justified by the annexed letter of Gen. E. S. Otis, dated 25th January; also on account of what took place at the conferences of the mixed commissions of Americans and Filipinos, which sat in Manila during the latter part of the said month of January to discuss matters and arrange for a basis of friendly relations between the two parties, which, it was hoped, would be permanent. Moreover, there was another reason, namely, the Filipinos were fully aware of the superior strength of your forces, against whom it would have been criminal folly to pit our inexperienced and undisciplined army.

Accordingly, it is unquestionable that we were not the aggressors, for we knew full well that were we to act on the offensive we could look for neither military nor political gain of any kind. On the contrary, we regarded such action as bordering on suicidal folly and well nigh sure to bring down on us the hatred and contempt of the American people. We had, in fact, nothing to gain and very much to lose by aggression.

Esteemed citizens of the United States, if with the foregoing reasoning there be borne in mind the fact that we were living in peace and harmony with your forces since June, without the smallest intention or inclination to commence hostilities, at a period when your forces were smaller and therefore more easy to cope with than subsequently, I verily believe that the enlightened people of the United States will not be slow to realize that it is not in the least degree probable, nor is it reasonable to assume, that we were the aggressors, seeing that we stood in need of their good will and were anxious to court and maintain a favorable impression with the American electorate in the interest of our cause. Peace and good will were essential to the success of our cause—a cause which would at once be jeopardized by any overt act of aggression.

We are neither celebrated warriors nor great fighters, nor are we as Quixotic as the Spaniards. We took up arms to obtain our independence, and it is self-evident that we did not develop our little armed force for the purpose of making an enemy of such a great and mighty people as the citizens of the United States in order that thereby our noble cause might the more easily triumph.

If we call to mind the fact that your President, Mr. McKinley, caused reinforcements to be sent to Manila after the capitulation by Spain on the 30th August, 1898; if we remember his refusal to listen to our humble petition to him, praying for recognition of our independence through our representative, Don Felipe Agoncillo, whom he refused to receive; or whether we recall the fact that he refused to give ear unto our appeal through the good offices of General Otis, as is proved by a letter from the general and the — to: and if we take into consideration that, lastly and finally, the treaty of Paris was so framed as to involve the cession of the sovereignty of Spain to the United States, I am of opinion that the most natural sequence of these incontestable moves of Mr. McKinley is to be found in the outbreak of hostilities, namely, an order from your President to General Otis to commence with acts of aggression and impose on us that odious sovereignty by force of arms, notwithstanding the fact that we had demonstrated and made it evident in every possible way from the first that we would accept no solution other than our independence.

You, honorable representatives of the people of the United States, having in view the providential bonds which bind the fate of the Philippines to your supreme decision, surely you will not be unmindful at such a momentous epoch of the sublime principles of right and justice proclaimed by the illustrious founders of your independence on 4th July, 1776. Endowed with those magnificent principles, your nation advanced rapidly along the paths of progress till it became great and powerful, admired and respected by all the aged States of Europe.

Trusting, therefore, in your glorious traditions of humanity and liberality, the Filipinos look forward with confidence to obtaining from your acknowledged rectitude a just resolution officially recognizing the independence of our beloved country.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, yours, very respectfully.

FELIPE BUENCAMINO.

TARLAC, P. I., August 20, 1899.

[Inclosures.]

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Singapore, June 10, 1898.

To His Excellency Gen. EMILIO AGUINALDO.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Allow me to tender you my most sincere congratulations on the brilliant success of your recent military achievements, the news of which prompted the patriotic demonstration here on the part of the Filipino residents of which I hand you the report inclosed.

All is coming to pass as I had hoped and predicted, and it is now being shown that I was right in arranging for your cooperation with Admiral Dewey, and equally right in asking that you are given the support and entrusted with the confidence of the American Government.

I trust that I shall next have the pleasure of congratulating you upon the capture of Manila, and when that occurs let me ask that you will send me some historic memento of the place and the incident, such as the flag or keys of the Ciudad or principal fortress, in souvenir of our meeting at Singapore and of the important results which have ensued.

It would also afford me particular pleasure to have an account from you direct of your proceedings since landing at Cavite, and I hope you will not hesitate to write anything that you may desire to communicate either to me personally or through me to the Government or the public.

Believe me, your sincere friend,

E. SPENCER PRATT.

CONSULATE GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Singapore, June 11, 1898.

To His Excellency Gen. EMILIO AGUINALDO.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I was most pleased to receive your letter of the 27th of last month informing me that you have safely arrived at Cavite and had



been so well treated by the officers of the *McCulloch* on the way, as I was sure you would be.

I wrote fully to Admiral Dewey concerning you, and to the American Government have pointed out that you and you alone were equal to the occasion.

Write me fully, and believe me, your true friend,

E. SPENCER PRATT.

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Hongkong, June 21, 1898.

Gen. E. AGUINALDO, Cavite, etc.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Your kind favor received.

Mr. Agoncillo has written me that you wish to send some of your Spanish prisoners to Hongkong; that they are an expense to you for food, etc. I thoroughly appreciate your position and the difficulties of looking after so many.

In case your prisoners can pay their steamship fare to Hongkong and His Excellency the Admiral has no objection to their leaving, I see no objection to your relieving yourself of them on their oath not to take up arms again. If you find any of them break oath and you capture them with arms in their hands give them the full penalty.

However, do not let any of your prominent prisoners leave or escape. Keep them as hostages. You may need them to redeem some of your own generals. Never mind about feeding them three meals every day. Rice and water will be a good diet. They have been living too high for the last few years.

Consult with Consul Williams and he will do everything in his power for you. He has your interests at heart.

Your representative here, T. Sandico, esq., who leaves to-day by *Zafiro*, has rendered you splendid service here. He is active, wise, and honest. I am greatly pleased with him, and trust you will send him back whenever you need anyone in Hongkong. The capture of Mr. Agoncillo's steamer, the *Pasig*, delayed all our plans and made the police very watchful. However, Mr. Evans is working as rapidly as possible. You will hear from him soon.

I trust Mr. Evans's steamer, the *Kwong Hoi*, with 43 of your leaders, arrived all right.

Accept my regards and congratulations.

Very truly, yours,

ROUNSEVELLE WILDMAN,  
Consul-General.

P. S.—I am sending some packages of medicine from M. Basa.

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Hongkong, June 23, 1898.

MY DEAR GENERAL AGUINALDO: I am sending you the mail by Jackson and Evans's steamer. In this morning's Press you will see a telegram to me from Port Said that notifies us that the Spanish relief fleet is on its way out to Manila.

Do not let this news disturb you. We have powerful monitors on their way from San Francisco.

Now, inasmuch as the Spanish want more bloodshed in the Philippines, I trust you will let them have a taste of real war. Do not be so tender with them. Handle them as they would treat you.

I suppose you have taken Manila by this time. I hope so.

I am sorry that Mr. Evans has not been able to get more arms to you. He has started three times, but each time the police have headed him off. They are very much on the alert since the capture of the *Pasig*. That was a most unfortunate affair, but no doubt Mr. Sandico has explained these matters to you.

Accept my sincere thanks for the Mauser. I will send the one to Mr. Consul-General Pratt in a few days.

Do whatever you can to aid Mr. Evans, and trusting victory will ever perch on your banners.

I am, very sincerely, yours,

ROUNSEVELLE WILDMAN,  
Consul-General.

CONSULATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT HONGKONG,  
Hongkong, July 14, 1898.

Gen. E. AGUINALDO,  
Cavite, Manila.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I have your kind favor of the 8th instant, and it is always a pleasure for me to hear from you and of your continued wonderful success in the field. You have certainly fulfilled nobly all the promises I made on your behalf to Admiral Dewey.

By the time you receive this you will learn of the wonderful victory achieved by Admiral Sampson at Santiago de Cuba—every Spanish ship sunk and not one of our ships injured and only three men killed. Every minute we expect to hear of the fall of Santiago.

I am very anxious that Manila should fall before peace negotiations come on. It looks very much now as though Spain was going to sue for peace, and that a truce will be declared within another two weeks. Manila should be taken before that time.

I am very sorry that Mr. Evans has not been able to deliver to you the arms. The seizure of the *Pasig* has put every official, Chinese and English, on the watch. However, you have seen Mr. Evans, and he can explain the matter to you thoroughly and what his future plans are.

I hear that the *Pasig* is now in Macao loading provisions and is going from there to Canton to try and ship arms. I hope they will succeed and soon be with you. I am very glad that there was no truth in the rumors that were afloat regarding your displeasure with Mr. Sandico.

The Mauser rifle came to hand, and I shall prize it highly as a gift from you. With kindest regards to your cabinet and officers,

I am, as ever, your friend,

ROUNSEVELLE WILDMAN,  
Consul-General.

CONSULATE-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Hongkong, June 25, 1898.

General AGUINALDO, Cavite.

MY DEAR GENERAL: The *Petrarch* leaves to-morrow morning, and I want to write you a few lines regarding the international situation of the Philippine Islands. I trust you will receive them in the same kindly spirit in which they are tendered.

Your work and ability has been fully recognized by not only the people of the United States but by the entire civilized world. Since the Cuban leaders have fallen to quarreling among themselves and their general, Garcia, has declined to have any further dealings with the United States to free Cuba and the Philippines from the cruel yoke of Spain, it all remains with you to retain this proud position. If you stand shoulder to shoulder with our forces and do not allow any small differences of opinion and fancied slight to

keep you from the one set purpose of freeing your islands from the cruelties and robberies under which it has been groaning for so many hundred years, your name in history will be a glorious one, and your reward from my own great country will be sure and lasting.

The latest telegraphic dispatches assert that all the great powers of Europe (except Great Britain) have arrived at an agreement that the Philippines can not become a part of the United States, but will be divided up among themselves, as has been the case with China. Should this prove to be true you have a greater battle on your hands than you have already had, and it will require all the power of the United States and Great Britain to keep your islands intact and to hold you as the first man in them. I have vouched for your honesty and earnestness of purpose to the President of the United States and to our people, and they are ready to extend their hand to you as a brother and aid you in every laudable ambition. There are greater prizes in the world than being the mere chief of a revolution. I look to you to bear me out in all my promises, and I give you my assurance that you can always call upon me to act as your champion should any try to slander your name.

Do not forget that the United States undertook this war for the sole purpose of relieving the Cubans from the cruelties under which they were suffering, and not for the love of conquest or the hope of gain. They are actuated by precisely the same feelings toward the Filipinos. Whatever the final disposition of the conquered territory may be, you can trust the United States that justice and honor will control all their dealings with you. The first thing is to throw off the Spanish yoke. Do not let anything interfere with that. I believe in you. Do not disappoint me.

Sincerely, yours,

ROUNSEVELLE WILDMAN,  
Consul-General.

#### Proclamation announcing dictatorial government.

BELOVED COUNTRYMEN: I accepted the terms of peace arranged by Don Pedro A. Paterno with the captain-general of these islands conditionally, laying down our arms and disbanding the army, believing the adoption of that policy more conducive to the interests of our country than continuation of the insurrection with the limited resources at my disposal. However, as some of the conditions could not be fulfilled (some of our troops being dissatisfied and retaining their arms), and owing to the fact that up to the present time a period of five months has elapsed without the reforms being conceded which we stipulated for to fit our country for inclusion in the comity of civilized states, like our neighbor, Japan, for instance, which in the brief period of about twenty years had so progressed as to leave little cause to envy others, demonstrating her vigor and superiority in the recent war with China, I am cognizant that, even if willing, the Spanish Government is incapable of coping with certain elements which invariably obstruct the advancement of their country and which lethal influence was the principal cause of the uprising of the masses. Now, therefore, as the great North American nation has evinced disinterestedness in our welfare and stretches forth her hand to help us to obtain our liberty, I again assume control of our hosts in their endeavors to attain the grand object we all have in view, establishing a dictatorship and issuing decrees on my own responsibility, with the advice and approval of illustrious fellow-countrymen, until such time as all the islands own our sway, when a properly constituted popular assembly can be formed and elect a president, with a cabinet, into whose hands I will surrender supreme authority.

Done in Cavite on the 24th day of May, 1898.

EMILIO AGUINALDO.

UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCE ON ASIATIC STATION,  
FLAGSHIP OLYMPIA,  
Cavite, P. I., June 16, 1898.

DEAR GENERAL AGUINALDO: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 15th instant, and will take pleasure in transmitting the inclosed decrees to my Government.

The letters which accompanied the above have been forwarded to the British consul at Manila, as requested.

Yours, sincerely,

GEORGE DEWEY,  
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy.

His Excellency Gen. Don EMILIO AGUINALDO, Bacoor.

UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCE ON ASIATIC STATION,  
FLAGSHIP OLYMPIA,  
Cavite, P. I., June 23, 1898.

DEAR GENERAL AGUINALDO: Mr. Rawson Walker, the British consul and acting United States consul at Manila, requests me to ask that you will grant passes (1) for Mr. Fitton to go to Malabon in a British launch and bring back to Manila some Chinese who desire to go to Hongkong, list of whom is enclosed; (2) for Messrs. Charles T. Broyud, George Moore, and Robert Brough to return to their duties in the railway depot at Calocan.

I am, very sincerely,

GEORGE DEWEY,  
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy,  
Commanding United States Naval Force on Asiatic Station.

His Excellency D. EMILIO AGUINALDO, Cavite.

UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCE ON ASIATIC STATION,  
FLAGSHIP OLYMPIA,  
Cavite, P. I., July 4, 1898.

DEAR GENERAL AGUINALDO: I beg to inform you that I am requested by Mr. E. H. Rawson Walker, British consul and acting United States consul, to transmit to you the following requests for passes:

From Messrs. Smith, Bell & Co., merchants, of Manila, for any member of their staff to travel through the northern provinces to keep up communication with their rice mills at Gerona, in Tarlac, and Bayambang, in Pangasinan, and with all outside buying stations.

From Mr. R. W. Hooper, of Manila, to travel in the various provinces to the northward to look after his rice business and Calumpit rice mill.

I am, very sincerely,

GEORGE DEWEY,  
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy.  
His Excellency Gen. D. EMILIO AGUINALDO.

UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCE ON ASIATIC STATION,  
FLAGSHIP OLYMPIA,  
Cavite, P. I., July 16, 1898.

DEAR GENERAL AGUINALDO: I send herewith a copy of a letter from the French consul at Manila regarding the taking of the steamer *Compania de Filipinas*.

I replied to him that the forces under my command were in no way concerned in this affair, but that I would transmit his letter to you with a request that you would show due regard for French interests.

Yours, sincerely,

GEORGE DEWEY,  
Rear-Admiral, United States Navy.

His Excellency Gen. DON EMILIO AGUINALDO, *Bacoor*.

[United States Volunteer Signal Corps. (Telegram received.) R. Ry. S. 28 words, dated Camp Dewey, 13.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
August 13, 1898. (Received at 8 a. m.)

To General AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Philippine Forces, *Bacoor*:

Do not let your troops enter Manila without the permission of the American commander. On this side of Pasig River you will be under our fire.

ANDERSON, *Brigadier-General*.

[United States Volunteer Signal Corps. (Telegram received.) Kllws 32 words, dated Ermita headquarters, 2d Division, 13.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
August 13, 1898. (Received at 6.35 p. m.)

To General AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Filipino Forces:

Taken. Serious trouble threatened between our forces. Try and prevent it. Your troops should not force themselves in the city until we have received the full surrender. Then we will negotiate with you.

ANDERSON, *Commanding*.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNOR,  
Manila, P. I., October 14, 1898.

General EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Philippine Revolutionary Forces, *Malolos, P. I.*

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of the 16th ultimo and beg to apologize for the late official recognition of the same, presenting as a reason for my delay the necessity of obtaining certain information in order to arrive at conclusions in matters materially affecting the substance of our late correspondence, the securing of which has been attended with considerable difficulty.

I fully appreciate the friendly spirit manifested toward my Government in your expressions of regard, which your action in retiring your troops has confirmed, but I believe that there has existed and still exists some misunderstanding as to the limits of territory which that Government is compelled to occupy and administer under its international obligations with Spain, the responsibility for which it can not escape.

The articles of capitulation transferred the city of Manila with suburbs and all defenses, as I had the honor to inform you in my letter of September 8. It was found impossible to determine definitely on any existing map either the limits of the city or the lines of its defenses. The latter had been variously placed, at some points retired and at others thrust out beyond conceded city limits. I therefore directed my chief engineer, by a careful search of the municipal records and an actual survey, to ascertain the lines within which occupation by United States troops was obligatory by reason of the terms of the surrender. He has finally concluded these directed labors and has presented a map, of which the inclosed blue print is a copy, on which is traced in white the lines determined upon. By reference to this print and a comparison of the same with all former existing maps of the city and suburbs it will be perceived that the latter varies materially from it, especially as to the trend of the Pasig River and the location of the Spanish defenses.

The lines of circumscription on the print begin at the Bocana de Vitas. From thence they follow Maypayao Creek until they reach the line of the Lico road, produced, thence proceed along said line and road to Lico, thence to the junction of the two roads in front of the Chinese Hospital, thence along the road in front of said hospital to the north corner of the hospital wall, thence to blockhouse No. 4, thence by blockhouses Nos. 5, 6, and 7 to San Juan del Monte Creek at the Aqueduct Bridge, thence down said creek and up the Rio Pasig to the mouth of Concordia Creek, thence by Concordia and Tripa de Gallians creeks to a point opposite the place where the road from Singalon to Pineda (Passy) turns sharply to the right, thence by road to Maytubig, and thence to the mouth of Malate Creek.

This map is believed to be correct, as the surveying and plotting were executed with the greatest care and with a desire for accuracy. The lines do not include all of the territory which the late Spanish chief engineer of the city has described as lying within its suburbs, and a larger proportion of them are drawn within the lines of the city's defenses, but they are partial and include all portions of the suburbs which my Government, under its promises to Spain, could be expected to hold possession of under any demands which Spain might present.

In your withdrawal of troops I note that to the north they retired to the line described on the map furnished by my predecessor, General Merritt, while to the east and south his request was not observed. As far as Paco is concerned it was understood that the troops in that section would be withdrawn within a short period of time, and I have now the honor to represent that the retention of that mutually conceded suburb has been a source of great annoyance to the American authorities, and as fully, I believe, to yourself, while the revolutionary forces along the Singalon and connecting roads have been the cause of complaint from the inhabitants of that section.

I am therefore compelled, by reason of my instructions, which direct me to execute faithfully the articles of the Spanish capitulation, because of the interests of my Government and, as I sincerely believe, the welfare of your own forces, to ask that you withdraw all your troops beyond the lines marked in the accompanying blue print, which are above described, and I must request such withdrawal on or before the 20th instant, else I shall be forced into some action looking to that end.

Permit me, in conclusion, General, to bring to your attention facts of which you are doubtless ignorant, and which all connected with the American authorities, especially that vast majority who have entertained a decided and pronounced friendly interest in the Philippine people, have viewed with more or less indignation.

In a number of instances kidnaping and robbery have been committed recently within this city by parties who claim to be connected with your forces, some of whom stated that they were acting under your instructions. This I can not believe; but the high-handed offenses committed by these persons show how important it is, for the interests of all concerned, to withdraw your troops as herein requested.

In numerous instances my officers have submitted complaints to me that they have been arrested and been compelled to turn back to the city, though journeying as unarmed and peaceful citizens, merely with the intent to seek health and recreation. And on Sunday last a funeral party of the British war ship *Powerful*, now lying within the harbor, was so delayed by the insurgent forces at Paco when proceeding to its English cemetery that it was

obliged to return to its vessel and repeat the journey on the following day. I fail to see how such proceedings can be justified before enlightened public opinion, and it is matter of profound surprise to me that a people seeking relief from the control of a government by which, in the pronounced judgment of a large portion of the civilized world, it has been oppressed for centuries, should permit its armed authorities to so conduct themselves as to arouse the indignation of friendly and assistant nations. The indignities which my Government has suffered from the revolutionary forces still illegally maintained at Paco (few of them are cited herein) can not be tolerated in future. Resistance to the high-handed proceedings there committed is not merely considered a duty from which there is no escape, but would be esteemed a virtue by any civilized government cognizant of the facts. I do not for a moment permit myself to entertain the impression that either you or the able advisers by whom you are surrounded have authorized these insults to my Government, but I must bring them to the notice of the authorities which maintain these troops and upon which rests the legal responsibility for their conduct.

There is another matter which I beg respectfully to present for your distinguished consideration. There is a great number of United States troops within this city and a large accession, primarily intended and equipped by my Government for use against the armed forces of Spain, is en route for this port. The continued unhealthfulness of the city, notwithstanding the strenuous efforts we are making for a thorough policing of the same, may make it necessary to temporarily encamp such troops as are suffering from diseases contracted here on some point of land near by promising favorable sanitary conditions for restoration to health. Should the emergency become imminent the dictates of humanity and the overwhelming demands of my Government would oblige me to establish a convalescent camp in this locality to which troops could be sent for recuperation and to relieve the congested situation which must attend the presence of so large a body of armed men within a thickly populated city. I have in mind for this possible camp the grounds on the shore of the bay formerly occupied by United States troops and designated "Camp Dewey," or the high ground to the east of the city. It is my great desire to place it at a locality which would not inconvenience any organizations connected with your forces or the surrounding inhabitants; and to the emergency of this anticipated proceeding I respectfully invite your consideration and ask your assistance should execution become necessary.

Should action of this character be decided upon, I beg of you to rest firmly in my unqualified assurances that it will be undertaken in a spirit of the greatest friendliness and with the sincere desire to neither compromise nor affect in the slightest degree your interests and those of the people whom you represent, but on the contrary to enhance them.

Permit me to subscribe myself, General,

With highest respect, your most obedient servant,

E. S. OTIS,  
Major-General, U. S. Volunteers,  
U. S. Military Governor in the Philippines.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNOR  
IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS,  
Manila, P. I., October 27, 1898.

Gen. EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Revolutionary Forces, *Malolos, P. I.*

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 22d instant, and have awaited the result of correspondence and conferences upon the subject of which you treat.

Concerning the conference of the 18th instant with your representative, Dr. Pardo de Tavera, it resulted in an honest misunderstanding between us in one slight particular only. The Doctor very ably, by letter, submitted your wishes, one of which was the retention of the blockhouses on the designated line. In regard to this matter I said that I was powerless to make any concessions, and in the conversation which followed remarked in substance, through the interpreter, that we did not wish to occupy them, as we did not consider them of any importance. The Doctor, I can conceive, very naturally misconstrued my meaning—in fact the interpreter might have done so—and when, on the 24th instant, the Doctor again called and forcibly expressed his construction of my language, I was so impressed with his earnestness and honesty of purpose and convictions I thereupon remarked that although the law would not permit a concession I would not raise any objection unless hereafter compelled to do so by my superior authority if your forces continued to occupy the blockhouses to the north of the Pasig River.

I have referred to General Merritt's letter of August 20, which you mention, and find, of course, that it is as you state. Unfortunately I am bound by the terms of capitulation, which recite "the city and defenses of Manila and its suburbs." Pandacan is certainly far within the line of defense and from information obtained from two weighty sources I have been led to believe that it has of late been considered one of the city's suburbs, although we have been unable to find any Spanish decree which fixes its status with definiteness.

In regard to the establishment of a convalescent camp for the restoration to health of members of my command, it was my intention to consult you and arrive at an understanding in the matter before attempting anything of the kind. I knew that you would not offer objections if it could be so placed as not to give your people annoyance, since it could not be in any wise a menace, but, on the contrary, would place our sick within your power and to a certain extent under your protection. I have that confidence in your humane sentiments and in the kindly impulses of your people as to believe that you would surely consent to a measure of this character, and I think that the poorer class of surrounding communities would be peculiarly benefited by the small trade that it will give rise to, as hospitals make many purchases of edible products which your people would be glad to furnish. Should necessity arise under which I would be forced to take action, it will be my pleasure to confer with you before proceeding in the matter, and I am fully convinced that you will give assent and also assistance.

Permit me, General, to assure you that I fully appreciate the difficulties under which you labor in your endeavors to carry out the desires and demands of your people. As I have already expressed myself in former communications, I am fully convinced of your wish to maintain harmonious relations with the United States forces and government of Manila, and that you deplore with me any proceeding which may disturb that harmony and friendly feeling. I have been fully aware that all unpleasant incidents which have occurred, and to which I alluded in my former letter, were due entirely to the irresponsible and unwarranted action of subordinates, and I am constantly called upon to correct misconceptions entertained by my troops and to punish offenses which they have wantonly committed.

I am gratified with the success, both as concerns the interests of the Philippine people and the United States troops, which has attended our mutual efforts for the amicable adjustment of affairs, and sincerely hope that the manifested good will which now exists by and between our forces may be long continued.

I am, General, most sincerely, your obedient servant,

E. S. OTIS,  
Major-General, U. S. Volunteers,  
U. S. Military Governor in the Philippines.



OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNOR  
IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS,  
Manila, P. I., November 2, 1898.

Gen. EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Philippine Revolutionary Forces, Malolos, P. I.

GENERAL: By direction of my Government, I have the honor to present for your distinguished consideration a subject which is causing much comment and a great deal of severe criticism of the actions of the Filipino people throughout Europe and among the very large class of Catholic citizens of my own country, and that is the retention as prisoners of the Spanish Catholic clergy and nuns. I believe that a vast majority of the reports of great cruelty and barbarous treatment practiced by the Filipinos toward these individuals which have been put in general circulation are untrue. Indeed I have forbidden cablegrams prepared on this subject, which I had good reason to suppose could not be substantiated, to be sent to other countries, and I have informed the United States authorities that the many rumors of this nature in circulation throughout the civilized world were greatly exaggerated. Still, however, facts stand out prominently that these individuals have suffered privations and hardships and are still held in captivity, and upon these fabrications charging most cruel and inhuman treatment, resulting in loss of life, will continue to be spread abroad to the great detriment of the interests and welfare of the Filipino people. I do not consider that I sacrifice in any particular the confidence reposed in me by my Government in communicating to you that it has been requested by the Vatican at Rome and by many distinguished men high in the councils of nations to employ its good offices in efforts to secure the liberty and freedom of action of the Spanish clergy and all individuals connected with religious orders now held in durance, among whom are especially mentioned the bishop of New Segovia and the nuns in the northwestern portion of the island of Luzon.

It is, of course, needless for me to present to you or the able counselors by whom you are surrounded, and, indeed, it may be considered a presumption on my part to invite your attention to the fact, that the clergy, and, indeed, the civil functionaries of the Spanish Government, can not, under a strict interpretation of the rules of international law, be declared prisoners of war, except in certain very aggravated cases. It would require most decided action on the part of members of religious orders to place them in that category, and the seizure and retention of or the interference with nuns in the practice of what they consider their duties under their sacred religious vows is invariably looked upon with marked disfavor by all nations claiming to practice civilized warfare. All this is well known to you, and I only allude to it to account in a measure for the erroneous impressions which publicly prevail regarding the humane sentiments and good intentions cherished by the Filipinos, and which are so damaging to them in securing a position as a people which they seek to invoke. You will please pardon me for this allusion, but the matter is so important to the best interests of the Filipinos that I have taken the liberty, uninvited, to present it.

Confident that you seek the welfare of your people, may I, in that confidence, ask you to use your conceded influence to correct this condition of affairs and to act with me in efforts to put an end to the acrimonious criticisms which now so widely prevail? I would be pleased to receive them here at Manila and care for them while they make preparations to leave the country, as I am informed many of them desire to do; and more particularly does it appear to me as most essential that prompt action be taken with regard to the nuns. Any traveling expense or cost of food which would be required to effect their removal to this point I would be glad to meet should you desire it.

I am, General, with great respect, your obedient servant,

E. S. OTIS,  
Major-General, U. S. Volunteers,  
U. S. Military Governor in the Philippines.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE,  
UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 4, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO Y FAMY,  
Commanding Philippine Forces, Cavite, Luzon, P. I.

GENERAL: I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the Kingdom of Spain, have entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands.

For these reasons I desire to have the most amicable relations with you and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces.

In our operations it has become necessary for us to occupy the town of Cavite as a base of operations.

In doing this I do not wish to interfere with your residence here and the exercise by yourself and other native citizens of all functions and privileges not inconsistent with military rule.

I would be pleased to be informed at once of any misconduct of soldiers under my command, as it is the intention of my Government to maintain order and to treat all citizens with justice, courtesy, and kindness.

I have, therefore, the honor to ask your excellency to instruct your officials not to interfere with my officers in the performance of their duties, and not to assume that they can not visit Cavite without permission.

Assuring you again of my most friendly sentiments and distinguished consideration.

I remain, with all respect,  
THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE,  
UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, Luzon, P. I., July 6, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO Y FAMY,  
Commanding Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: I am encouraged by the friendly sentiments expressed by your excellency in your welcome letter, received on the 5th instant, to endeavor to come to a definite understanding, which I hope will be advantageous to both.

Very soon we expect a large addition to our forces, and it must be apparent to you as a military officer that we shall require much more room in which to camp our soldiers, and also store room for our supplies. For this I should like to have your excellency's advice and cooperation, as you are best acquainted with the resources of this country.

It must be apparent to you that we do not intend to remain here inactive, but to move promptly against our common enemy. But for a short time we must organize and land supplies, and also retain a place for storing them near our fleet and transports.

I am solicitous to avoid any conflict of authority which might result from having two sets of military officers exercising command in the same place.

I am also anxious to avoid sickness by taking sanitary precautions. Your sanitary medical officers have been making voluntary inspections with mine,

and fear epidemic disease if the vicinity is not made clean. Would it not be well to have prisoners work to this end under the advice of the surgeon? I again renew my assurance of distinguished consideration.

I am, with great respect,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE,  
UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 14, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: Wishing to get complete information of the approaches to Manila from every direction, I, therefore, have the honor to request that you give my officers all possible assistance in making reconnaissance of the lines and approaches and that you favor them with your advice.

Officers coming from me will bear a note to that effect.

With great respect,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE,  
UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 19, 1898.

Señor D. EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding General, Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant. Your offer of assistance is appreciated and your assurances of good will are most gratifying. The difficulty of collecting supplies, referred to by you, is apprehended and will be considered in fixing compensation.

As a medium of communication with your people we will be pleased to have you assure them that there will be no confiscation of their property, that our requisitions will be reasonable, and that a fair compensation will always be given.

I remain, General, with all respect, your obedient servant,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE,  
UNITED STATES EXPEDITIONARY FORCE,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 19, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding General, Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: The bearer, Maj. J. F. Bell, United States Army, was sent by Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt, United States Army, to collect for him, by the time of his personal arrival, certain information concerning the strength and positions of the enemy and concerning the topography of the country surrounding Manila.

I would be obliged if you would permit him to see your maps and place at his disposal any information you may have on the above subjects, and also give him a letter or pass, addressed to your subordinates, which will authorize them to furnish him with any information they can on these subjects and to facilitate his passage along the lines upon a reconnaissance around Manila on which I propose to send him.

I remain, with great respect, your obedient servant,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE, U. S. EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 21, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding General, Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: I have the honor to request that passes and such other assistance as practicable be given to the bearer, Lieut. E. I. Bryan, and party, who are making a reconnaissance of the surrounding country.

Thanking you for assistance given on previous occasions.

I remain, with great respect, your obedient servant,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE, U. S. EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, P. I., July 23, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: When I came here three weeks ago I requested your excellency to give what assistance you could to procure means of transportation for the American army, as it was to fight in the cause of your people. So far we have received no response.

As you represent your people, I now have the honor to make requisition on you for 500 horses, 50 oxen and ox carts.

If you can not secure these, I will have to pass you and make requisition directly on the people.

I beg leave to request an answer at your earliest convenience.

I remain, with great respect,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS FIRST BRIGADE, U. S. EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,  
Cavite Arsenal, Luzon, P. I., July 24, 1898.

Señor Don EMILIO AGUINALDO Y FAMY,  
Commanding Philippine Forces.

GENERAL: Your favor of the 26th ultimo, in relation to requisitions for cattle, horses, etc., is satisfactory. I regret that there should have been any misunderstanding about it. The people to whom we applied, even for the hiring of carromatas, etc., told our people that they had orders to supply nothing except by your orders. I am pleased to think that this was a misapprehension on their part.

We are not so unreasonable as to suppose that all we want can be supplied at once or from one place. We may even have to send to other islands. Our quartermaster will establish a depot near the American camp, where he will receive and pay for supplies, and from which he will send out parties to whatever places your excellency will indicate to transact business with your people.

With great regard, your obedient servant,

THOMAS M. ANDERSON,  
Brigadier-General, U. S. Volunteers, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE PACIFIC  
AND EIGHTH ARMY CORPS,  
Manila, P. I., January 9, 1899.

Gen. EMILIO AGUINALDO,  
Commanding Revolutionary Forces, Malolos, P. I.

GENERAL: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of to-day, and I am much pleased at the action you have taken. I greatly regret that you have not a clear understanding of my position and motives, and trust that my explanation, assisted by the conference I have invited, will make them clear to you.

In my official capacity I am merely the agent of the United States Government to conduct its affairs under the limits which its Constitution, laws, precedents, and specific instructions prescribe. I have not the authority to recognize any national or civil power not already formally recognized by my Government unless specially authorized so to do by the instructions of the Executive of the United States. For this reason I was unable to receive officially the representatives of the revolutionary government and endeavored to make that inability clear to the distinguished gentlemen with whom I had the pleasure to converse a few evenings since. They will bear witness that my course throughout my entire official connection with affairs here has been consistent, and it has pained me that I have not been able to receive and answer communications of the cabinet officers of the government at Malolos, fearing that I might be erroneously charged with lack of courtesy.

Permit me now briefly, General, to speak of the serious misunderstanding which exists between the Filipino people and the representatives of the United States Government, and which I hope that your commissioners, by a thorough discussion, may be able to dispel. I sincerely believe that all desire peace and harmony, and yet by the machinations of evil-disposed persons we have been influenced to think that we occupy the position of adversaries. The Filipinos appear to be of the opinion that we meditate attack, while I am under the strict orders of the President of the United States to avoid conflict in every way possible. My troops, witnessing the uneasiness, the comparatively disturbed and unfriendly attitude of the revolutionary troops and many of the citizens of Manila, conclude that active hostilities have been determined upon, although it must be clearly within the comprehension of unprejudiced and reflecting minds that the welfare and happiness of the Filipino people depend upon the friendly protection of the United States. The hand of Spain was forced, and she has acknowledged before the world that all her claimed rights in this country have departed by due process of law. This treaty acknowledgment, with the conditions which accompany it, awaits ratification by the Senate of the United States; and the action of its Congress must also be secured before the Executive of that Government can proclaim a definite policy. That policy must conform to the will of the people of the United States expressed through its Representatives in Congress. For that action the Filipino people should wait, at least, before severing the existing friendly relations. I am governed by a desire to further the interests of the Filipino people and shall continue to labor with that end in view. There shall be no conflict of forces if I am able to avoid it; and still I shall endeavor to maintain a position to meet all emergencies that may arise.

Permit me to subscribe myself, General, with the highest respect, your most obedient servant,

E. S. OTIS,

Major-General, United States Volunteers, Commanding.

MANILA, P. I., January 7, 1899.

I am authorized by General Otis to say that he, as commanding general of the United States army in the Philippines, will appoint two representatives to confer with a like number appointed by General Aguinaldo, commanding general of the revolutionary forces, should General Aguinaldo desire, as has been intimated to me.

I am also authorized to say that General Otis would be pleased to meet, at any time, representative Filipino men of character and influence.

O. W. CARMAN.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNOR  
IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS,  
Manila, P. I., January 25, 1899.

Brigadier-General HUGHES,

Chairman of committee appointed to meet a committee appointed by General Aguinaldo to confer with regard to the situation of affairs and to arrive at a mutual understanding of the intent, purposes, aim, and desires of the Filipino people and the people of the United States.

SIR: I am informed that the Filipino people do not place confidence in our good intentions which they are seeking from this conference. The fact that the President has appointed a commission seems to have confirmed them in their impressions. It might be well therefore to give you a brief history of events having relation to these commissions. They are as follows:

Early in December Admiral Dewey and myself received instructions from Washington to report the condition of affairs and offer suggestions. Upon December 7 Admiral Dewey telegraphed as follows:

"It is strongly urged that the President issue a proclamation defining the position of the United States Government in the Philippine Islands and showing the inhabitants that it is our intention to interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines as little as possible; that as they develop their capabilities of government, their powers and privileges will be increased. That will allay the spirit of unrest. The Spanish soldiers should be expatriated as soon as possible; they are a source of discord and danger."

And the Admiral goes on to say that a force of several regiments raised from among the best insurgent troops and officered by the best of their leaders would do much to disarm opposition.

Upon this suggestion I think the proclamation was issued. Later, Admiral Dewey cabled (I think some time about the 1st of January). I am not aware of the date that he thought the appointment of a commission by the President would be an excellent thing. On January 10 I was asked by the Washington authorities what I thought of the appointment of a commission to confer with the revolutionary authorities and I replied that I thought it might do excellent work here. Before this date, early in January, I had been requested by prominent Filipinos to appoint a committee from my own command to meet a like committee to be appointed by General Aguinaldo. This was done on January 9, one day before receiving the Washington dispatch asking if I thought the appointment of a commission by the President would be advantageous. Hence, what might be styled the two commissions, have no relationship whatever, the one of which you are president sitting to ascertain the desires of the Filipinos and having no authority to grant concessions except by permission of the Washington authorities, the other commission, appointed from Washington, comes with full instructions from the President of the United States and empowered to act for him.

On January 16 I telegraphed to Washington as follows:  
"Conditions improving, confidence of citizens returning, business active. Conference held Saturday. Insurgents presented following statements, asking that it be cabled. Undersigned commissioners of commander in chief of revolutionary army of these islands state to commissioners of General Otis

that aspiration Filipino people is independence with restrictions resulting from conditions which its government agree with America when latter agree to officially recognize the former. No conclusion reached; another conference to-morrow evening. I understand insurgent wish qualified independence under United States protection."

To this dispatch no reply has been received.

Upon another matter, viz, the sending of regular troops here, the purpose of which has been greatly misconstrued, you may communicate the following dispatch, received on December 7:

"General OTIS, Manila:

"The Secretary of War directs you to send Astor Battery home on first returning transport. If you can spare volunteers to take first returning ships send them in the order of their arrival. Six regular regiments are in course of preparation to report to you. It is probable that part of them will sail direct from this coast by way of canal, thus to give you good transport available for service from San Francisco."

The meaning and intent of this dispatch was to return the volunteer troops as soon as possible and to send part back in the transports then in the harbor if practicable. The Astor Battery was sent home, but I declined to send the other volunteer troops at that time, as the revolutionary government had assumed a threatening attitude, notwithstanding our great desire for peace and harmony. The orders from Washington have not changed. I still have authority to return the volunteer troops, so that they can be discharged in the United States, by any returning vessel available, but I decline to return them as long as we are threatened with active hostilities. Under the articles of capitulation still prevailing with Spain, as there has been no ratification as yet of a treaty, I am obliged to hold Manila and its defenses, but no hostile act will be inaugurated by the United States troops.

Very sincerely, yours,

E. S. OTIS,

Major-General, United States Volunteers,  
United States Military Governor in the Philippines.

REPORT ON THE JOINT COMMISSION.

MANILA, P. I., January 29, 1899.

The sixth conference of the commissioners appointed by Major-General Otis and General Aguinaldo was held at 4 o'clock on the afternoon of the above date. The commissioners first engaged in the reading, correction, and amending of the proceedings of the previous meetings, which were definitely approved and signed by both commissioners, each one retaining two copies, one in English and the other one in Spanish, of the proceedings of each session.

The commissioners of General Otis presented to those of General Aguinaldo a letter directed by the first-named general to Brigadier-General Hughes, which was read there and a copy of which is herein attached, marked "Exhibit A."

The commissioners for General Aguinaldo then presented to the commission for General Otis the alleged constitution of the Philippine republic claimed by them to have been formed and also a list of the delegates to an alleged Congress which framed said alleged constitution. Said documents are marked exhibits "B" and "C," respectively.

Thereupon the commissioners for General Otis and the commissioners for General Aguinaldo having fully set out their views during the various conferences, it was announced that there was no further business for the present to be transacted by the commissioners of the respective parties.

The commissioners of General Aguinaldo stated afterwards that they were pleased to acknowledge the great courtesy with which the commissioners for General Otis had treated them and to which they had endeavored to correspond, although feeling sorry that the several conferences held had not given the positive result which they desired and which would satisfy the just and legitimate aspirations of the country.

To which the commissioners of General Otis responded that they were reciprocally indebted to the commissioners of General Aguinaldo for a courteous, calm, and deliberate discussion of the various matters raised in their conferences; that they believed the true interests of the Philippine people were in substantial harmony with American interests in these islands, and that recognition of this fact and substantial agreement could not be long delayed.

The joint commission thereupon adjourned to meet on Tuesday, January 31, 1899, at 4 o'clock p. m.

R. P. HUYLUS.  
JAMES HJUNLT.  
ELLELERESODE.  
FLORENTINO TORRES.  
A. FLORES.  
MANUEL ARGUELLES.

Certifico: que los documentos en Inglés transcritos que anteceden son copia fiel de sus originales que obran en los Archivos de ésta Secretaría.

Tarlac, 20 de Agosto de 1899.

El Secretario de Negocios Extranjeros,  
[Seal of the secretariat.]

FELIPE BUENCAMINO.

[Translation.]

I certify that the foregoing documents are true copies of the originals, which are kept in the archives of this secretariat.

Tarlac, August 20, 1899.

[SEAL.]

FELIPE BUENCAMINO,  
Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I now desire to read a document which I asked to have printed a little while ago. These are a series of questions propounded by myself and replied to by Sixto Lopez.

Q. Will you please state from what part of the Philippines you come and what relations you have had with other Filipinos or with those claiming authority under the native government?

LOPEZ. I am a Tagal from Balayan, in the province of Batangas, Luzon. I have been working for the last twelve years in order to secure the independence of the Philippines. I am in no sense an official representative of any governmental or military body, nor do I belong to the Hongkong or any other junta. But as a Filipino, knowing the desires of the Filipinos, I claim the right, as a private citizen, to state what those desires are and to tell what I know about my fellow-countrymen.

Q. Were you ever engaged in affairs of government, local or general; and if so, in what capacity?

LOPEZ. Under the Spanish régime I held the position of Cabeza de Barangay in Balayan during the years 1880 to 1892.

Q. Have you been in any of the islands other than Luzon?

\*Signature very indistinct; impossible to decipher.



LOPEZ. Yes. I traveled in one of our family's ships for twenty months throughout Luzon, the Visayan Islands, and Mindoro, visiting Cavite, Bataan, Laguna, Rizal, Bulacan, Dagupan in Pangasinan, Zambales, Batangas, Tayabas, South Camarinis, Albay, Sorsogon, Mindoro, Marinduque, Burias, Masbate, Ticao, Zamar, and Leyte. I have also lived, at various times, for nearly eight years in Manila, in which students gather from all parts of the archipelago.

Q. You claim to have a knowledge of your countrymen's political desires, as well as their attainments and abilities?

LOPEZ. Yes. I have followed the fortunes of my country for a longer period and with closer attention than probably any American has done. I have what few Americans possess, namely, a personal knowledge of the conditions that existed prior to the insurrection against Spain, and long prior to the time when any American gave attention to our country. My knowledge has not been gained by a few months' residence in the islands during a period of war, when most of the normal conditions have been upset, and when an accurate estimate of the real facts is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. I have noted the changes that have ensued during the last ten years, and have been in touch with, or have watched the career of, prominent Filipinos who have taken part in public affairs during the last fifteen years. I mention these facts, not with the idea of boasting, but in order to show that I have probably as extensive a knowledge of Philippine affairs as many of those who claim to speak for the Filipinos. But I do not claim to have as great a knowledge of my countrymen as the many able Filipinos whose testimony could easily be obtained, and ought to be obtained by the Senate committee, before any legislation is inflicted upon the Philippines.

Thus, if the evidence of statesmen is required, call Mabini, Barretto, Raimundo, Melliza Ocampo, Guerrero, Ponce, Paterno, Potenciano Hilario, Dr. José Luna, Aguilera, Loizaga, Palma, Osmena, Graciano Gonzaga (civil governor of Cagayan Province), Climaco (governor of Cebu), Noserio Constantino, Aguado Velarde, Dr. Albert, Arsenio C. Herrera, Diego Gloria, or Dr. Justo Lucban.

If the evidence of soldiers is sought for, summon Aguinaldo, Malvar, Trias, Sandico, Lucban, Louis Luna, Alijandrino, Concepcion, Villa, Cailles, Delgado (governor of Iloilo), Ambrocio Flores (governor of Rizal Province), Canon Bolaños, Paciano Rizal (brother of the martyr), Pablo Tesson, Ison (banished to Guam), Mascardo, Hernandez, Tino, Dancel, Riego, Katigbak, or Kalaw.

Merchants and business men would be represented by Gonzalo Tuason, Telesforo Chuidian, Mariano Linghap, Crisanto Lichanco, Pedro P. Roxas, Vincente D. Fernandez, Luis R. Yangco, Rama, Bernardo Solis, Pascual Ledesma, or Genato.

While professional men would be adequately represented by Dr. Rigidor, Chief Justice Arellano, Dr. Apacible, Dr. Ilustre, Judge Arancio, Dr. Boldomiro Roxas, Dr. Llorente, Solicitor-General Araneta, Dr. Ortigas, or Dr. Miciano.

If it be the desire to know the real situation without hedging or trimming to suit any particular policy, the aspirations of the Filipinos and their ability to maintain those aspirations, and what the Filipinos think of the campaign of forcible subjugation and its effects upon the relations of the two peoples call some of these men that I have mentioned. It is true that they are opposed to the present policy, but broad-minded statesmen will not think less of them or seek to discredit their evidence on matters of fact simply because they are opponents.

Q. What proportion of the inhabitants of the archipelago may be considered a homogeneous race?

LOPEZ. The proportion can be stated approximately only. Assuming that the population of the entire archipelago is 10,000,000, I should say that 90 to 95 per cent are of common racial descent and religion, and are as homogeneous a people as the Japanese. These are the inhabitants of Luzon, Masbate, the Visayan Islands, and the coasts of Mindanao, who speak several dialects which are based upon, and are very similar to, Tagal, which in turn is allied to the older Malayan language. The Moros of central Mindanao and the Sulu Islands are of slightly different racial origin, and practice the Mohammedan religion. These people, together with the Negritos, the Igorrotes, and a few unimportant mountain tribes, number probably less than half a million.

Q. How do the Filipinos, assuming that they were granted independence, propose to deal with the Moros and the condition of slavery among them?

LOPEZ. The problem of how to deal justly, under one central government with a people whose institutions are contrary to the principles of personal liberty, would be less difficult for the Filipinos than for America. The Moros have signified their willingness to join with the Filipinos in forming a government, and the union would be more natural than a union with America, for, with the exception of religion and polygamy and slavery, there is much in common between the two peoples. Our constitution provided for complete personal liberty and the purity of the marriage relation, and it would be our duty to uphold those principles. But we do not propose to force our ideals upon the Moros. If they join with us and accept our constitution, we shall be glad; but if for a time they preferred to maintain a semi-independent relation, with some form of federal union for defensive and commercial purposes, we should be satisfied. Some such arrangement as this would meet their case until moral suasion induced them to recognize the civilized world's conception of the purity of marriage, and to admit that "man has no right of property in man."

Q. Would chaos, bloodshed, and disorder follow the withdrawal of American control?

LOPEZ. That is a gratuitous assumption, for which there is not the slightest warrant in fact or in history. It is not a reason, but an excuse for a continuance of foreign rule. As to the liability of tribal disputes and internecine wars, I have no hesitation in saying that the danger exists no more in the Philippines than in America or in any other country. The so-called "tribes" in the Philippines are no more tribes in the sense of being distinctive aggregations of people than are the people of the 45 States of America. There is not even that healthy rivalry which ought to exist, such as is found among the States of this Union.

All statements or prophecies as to what may occur in the future are of small value compared with what has really happened in the past. If such tribal animosity had existed it would have shown itself during the Spanish régime, for Spain's control was too feeble to have prevented its manifestation. But during the entire three hundred years of Spanish occupation there has not been a single case of tribal war or feud. The only two instances of Filipinos fighting against each other (and these were not tribal conflicts) were when Magellan, for his own purpose, induced part of the Visayan inhabitants of the island of Negros to fight against the fellow Visayans in the same island; and when the Spanish, and later the Americans, for the same purpose as Magellan, induced the Macabebes (who are not a tribe, but simply the inhabitants of the town of Macabebe in Pampanga) to fight against their fellow-Pampangos and the Filipinos generally.

Furthermore, during the period of about ten months when our Government held control of practically the entire Christianized population (for all that time the American forces were confined to a small area around Manila) there was no single instance of tribal discord or anarchy. On the contrary, good order existed, and life and property were respected and their security maintained. Our family and the people of our province testify that never within known history had there been such peace, contentment, and good government as then existed under Filipino rule. This was not because our

government was well organized, for that was impossible in so short a time, but because the Filipinos are naturally a law-abiding people, which counts for more in stable government than the most perfect and powerful organization.

There is also the groundless fear that if internal control were given to the Filipinos those of our fellow-countrymen who had supported American authority would be liable to maltreatment and disability. But we know that a large proportion of those who openly support American authority do so only to avoid suspicion. There may be some who, for reasons of their own, have taken up a position in favor of American occupation, temporary or permanent, and there are a few also who have fought against their fellow-countrymen. The treatment by our people of such men as Baencamino, Dr. Pardo de Tavera, Legarda, and the Macabebes—who, notwithstanding the fact that they opposed the Filipinos in the insurrection against Spain, were given positions under Aguinaldo's government,—is in itself sufficient to dispel any fear of future ill treatment. But at the proper time satisfactory undertakings could be given of protection and of amnesty to those who have taken up arms against our people for all acts done under American authority. America would always have the right and the means to enforce such contracts, and thus ample protection would be given to these men.

From my knowledge of my fellow-countrymen, I have no hesitation in saying that the whole alleged difficulty is purely fanciful, and to inflict us, on that account, with a period of American occupation—half American, half Filipino, with responsibility thus resting on two stools—would be unwise and impracticable. Under such a régime the best Filipinos would hold aloof and the government would be crowded with office seekers and self-seekers whose interest would be confined chiefly to what they could make. If we should be placed even for a time under a half-and-half government, where responsibility could be pushed off from one set of shoulders onto the other, and vice versa, the result will be deplorable to our people and ruinous to our country. Whereas if we are granted control of our own internal affairs, and a full measure of responsibility, the best and most public-spirited Filipinos would come to the front with a genuine desire to serve the public interest and to secure the success of our government. This, of course, would not prevent America from adopting any legitimate means of safeguarding her interests and obligations or of exacting guaranties for the due fulfillment of all agreements or treaties. But it would save our government from being exploited by the worst class of both Americans and Filipinos.

Q. Who are the Macabebes?

LOPEZ. There is a great deal of misapprehension about these Macabebes. It is believed by many persons in America that the Macabebes are a separate and distinct "tribe of savages" who have an undying hatred to the Filipinos. Whereas the Macabebes are simply the inhabitants of the town of Macabebe in the province of Pampanga. But it is wrong to suppose that all the people of this town are opposed to the Filipinos. Furthermore, there are, as Governor Taft admits in his evidence before the Senate committee, other Filipinos fighting with the American forces, all of whom are classed as Macabebes. Now, all of these men are the traitors—the Benedict Arnolds—and the offenders of criminality and wickedness. That such men should have been permitted to march under your sacred Stars and Stripes is one of the marvels of the twentieth century. That such men as these should have been used by America, of all nations, to crush liberty out of a struggling republic is unquestionably the eighth wonder of the world.

It has been said that the man who criticizes his country when it is actually at war comes perilously near being a traitor. What shall be said, then, of the man who joins the invader and fights against his fellow-countrymen? And what shall be said of the invader who employs and consorts with a regiment of Benedict Arnolds to fight under the symbol of light of law?

Q. What did the Filipinos hope to obtain by fighting?

LOPEZ. I have always held that war was not the means by which to obtain our rights. I have sent many dispatches to the Philippines urging Aguinaldo and the Hongkong junta to cease hostilities and to endeavor to secure our rights by peaceable means. I knew that a war between an Anglo-Saxon and an Eastern race was sure to degenerate into a wholesale massacre. But I believed, and most of the Filipinos believed and still believe, that although they could never hope for one moment to defeat America they would have been able to defend themselves if the war had been confined to civilized methods. This belief has had some justification, for the Filipinos were not defeated until it was found to be necessary, and declared to be necessary, to adopt the methods of Weyler, with reconcentration and torture and wholesale slaughter. Let me say here that although I abhor torture and cruelty, I do not lay the blame upon those who were set a task which admittedly they could not accomplish without resorting to such methods.

The desire for national liberty is so strong with the Filipinos that nothing but cruelty and wholesale slaughter could give a temporary victory to those who wished to crush it out. And in the future nothing but absolute despotism will hold that desire in check. The war has at least served one good purpose of giving unquestionable proof that the Filipinos are thoroughly in earnest about independence, and the torture and horror necessary to end that war have made the proof absolute. Let me also point out that wholesale slaughter alone has not been sufficient to secure a victory over the Filipinos. It has been necessary to pass laws under the civil government to take away the most elementary rights of a civil community. It has been necessary to imprison noncombatants and neutrals who, it was and is declared, were to be protected; to seize and confiscate the property of the wealthy who were once declared to be in favor of American rule; and to bring about a reign of political terror under which no Filipino dared even to whisper the desires of his heart; and to cause that ill-starred island of the Pacific to be still the prison of honest men. If anyone doubts these statements or fondly imagines that the tortures and imprisonments have been "greatly exaggerated" it is easy to obtain convincing evidence.

Call the Filipinos to testify; there are thousands of them now in prison who can tell the story. Examine the laws made by the so-called civil government and inquire why it was necessary to make such laws. Do not rest satisfied with the conscience-easing assumption that the reports have been exaggerated. Ask Capt. George Curry, chief of the Manila police, to testify. He is a fearless, honest man, without an ax to grind or a personal interest to serve, and will tell the truth, even if it cause parties or administrations to fall. And if the Filipinos have committed atrocities, let that be investigated also. The Filipinos do not shrink from inquiry or desire to have those of their people shielded who have committed punishable offenses.

Q. What proportion of the natives of the archipelago possess a liberal education?

LOPEZ. The whole question of education in the Philippines has become confused by want of definition of the terms used to describe it. The word "educated" has often been applied indiscriminately to the highly educated and to the merely literate. "Literacy" has been applied without distinction to those who can read and write Spanish, as well as to those who can read and write the native language. By thus using indefinite terms apparently different conclusions have been reached by those who have given evidence on the subject.

Let me therefore state what I understand to be the facts, and then compare those facts with the evidence of others:

The number of those who can read and write in the Spanish or the native language and have an elementary knowledge of arithmetic, etc., has been estimated by various authorities at from 60 to 80 per cent of the Christian



population. My own belief is that probably 75 per cent can so read and write. Of these about 30 per cent can speak Spanish; some, of course, indifferently, but many as though it were their mother tongue.

Of course until a proper census has been taken it is difficult to accurately determine the extent of literacy in the Philippines. The difficulty presses with equal force upon friend and opponent, but there are other sources of information by which a fairly accurate idea of the truth is obtainable.

Prior to the Spanish occupation elementary education was probably more extensive in the Philippines than in any other European country at that time. Dr. de Morga, the first governor-general, in his book published in 1609, tells how the Filipinos had a written language of their own, and declares that "there were very few who could not write well and correctly." Notwithstanding Spanish indifference and monastic opposition, the Filipinos have opened elementary schools in almost every village. They have also founded high schools and university colleges throughout the archipelago, and a university, two large normal schools for male and female teachers, and five large schools for women in Manila. In a recent article in the Outlook, Mr. Atkinson, superintendent of public instruction in the Philippines, states that "Since the coming of the Americans private schools have sprung up like mushrooms." Mr. Atkinson is wrong in implying that these schools are a result of American activity, for in most cases they formerly existed but had been closed by the war. The Schurman Commission declares that "A system of free schools for the people has been an important element in every Philippine programme of reforms."

General MacArthur holds that "this almost universal aspiration for education should appeal strongly to American sympathy." The president of the Royal University of Manila, one of the bitterest opponents of the Filipinos, had to admit in his evidence before the Schurman Commission that, all things considered, "education in this country is very far advanced, both in the primary grades and in the university grades;" whilst in an article submitted to the Senate committee when Governor Taft was giving his evidence and stated by Mr. Root to have been "compiled in the Division of Insular Affairs from standard works and the records of the Department, supplemented by the personal experience of returning officers," it is stated that "most of them (Filipinos), both men and women, can read and write."

In view of all this testimony taken, please observe, from non-Filipino sources, it is inconceivable that the Filipinos are as ignorant and illiterate as some persons declare them to be.

It is also difficult to say what proportion of Filipinos have received a liberal education. It would be just as difficult for an American to say what proportion of Americans have received a liberal education, for statistics are not easily obtainable, and the term liberal education has no definite meaning. But the president of the Royal University of Manila declares that education in the university grades is very far advanced. The Schurman Commission reports that the educated Filipinos are far more numerous than is generally supposed, that they are not confined to Manila, but are found throughout the archipelago, and that they are "the equals of the men one meets in similar vocations—law, medicine, business, etc.—in Europe or America."

Q. Are the Filipinos, in your opinion, fit for self-government?

LOPEZ. The Filipinos have all the qualities essential to fit a people for self-government. According to the Schurman Commission, the Filipinos "are naturally and normally peaceful, docile, and deferential to constituted authority," possessing "admirable domestic and personal virtues." They are naturally a law-abiding people, as was shown by their peaceful demeanor during the above-mentioned period, when there was no well-organized authority. But above all, not only is education fairly well advanced, and this under the most adverse circumstances, but the desire for education is, and always has been, uppermost in the minds of the people. Furthermore, the Filipinos have had a bitter lesson in the ill effects of bad government. They know by personal experience, which is worth more than mere theorizing, the disasters that corruption and dishonesty bring. And, like the Americans of 1776, they know what it is to have liberty denied them, and that is the most important factor of all, for only those who have suffered the loss of liberty know how to appreciate it, and to extend it to others.

The war, too, has served to weld the people into a unity which does not usually exist in communities which for long years have been at peace. It has also served to sift the wheat from the chaff, to determine who could be trusted with the responsibility of the public welfare and who were merely self-seekers, ready to desert the standard at the first breath of calamity or to sell their country to a higher bidder.

Our educated and intelligent men would naturally be at the head of affairs, as is the case in every other country. And with a law-abiding people, with education ever increasing under our own guidance, with prosperity increasing under the new incentives to industry, which would go to swell our own national wealth, I have no fear but that self-government would be such a success in our country as to put to shame and confusion all those who have been theorizing about our inability and their superiority.

Q. Are the Filipinos in favor of independence, immediate or ultimate?

LOPEZ. Yes; the Filipinos, both rich and poor, great and small, educated and uneducated, are in favor of independence—immediate, if they can get it, or ultimate if it is not to be granted immediately. They are universally opposed to foreign rule. First, because they have suffered from it in the past, and secondly, because they have a God-implemented desire to see their country subject to no power save that of their Creator. Whatever is done in the Philippines, let it not be based on the false assumption that the Filipinos desire American rule. I have repeatedly urged the taking of a plebiscite on this issue in, say, ten of the most representative cities and towns in the archipelago, and I hereby challenge those who contend that the Filipinos are in favor of foreign rule to put their contention to this test. The Filipinos would be prepared to pay the incidental expenses of such a plebiscite, and to abide by the result.

Q. Would the Filipinos object to the sale of public lands and franchises under present circumstances?

LOPEZ. Most assuredly they would. Until the Filipinos have at least internal control of their own affairs it would be a most improper thing to alienate the public lands or to dispose of franchises to foreign capitalists. Under present conditions, when the Filipinos are impoverished by six years of war, when their crops and towns have been destroyed, and when their working animals have almost all died of rinderpest, it would be most unfair to the Filipinos to compel them to compete with foreign capitalists in the purchase of public lands and franchises. The foreign capitalist could, in every case, outbid the native, and the result would be another and a worse Ireland, with everything of value in the hands of absentees, whose only interest in the country would be what profits could be squeezed out of it. Besides, the greatest danger to the independence of the Philippines would come from vested interests. We might be as fit for self-government as any country in the world, but the fact would not appeal to the foreign investor.

The theory that trade follows the flag is not a tenth part as true as the fact that the flag is made to follow capital. The capitalist naturally wants his own country to have control wherever his capital is invested. He wants maximum profits with minimum risks, and the interests of the native inhabitants are always made subservient to the interests of capital. Furthermore, the sale of such franchises during a period of American control would be a sale by Americans to Americans of property which belonged by moral right

at least to Filipinos. It would be in the interests of Americans and not necessarily in the interests of Filipinos, yet if the effects were politically detrimental it would be the Filipinos and not the Americans who would have to suffer. It may be urged that the sale would be to the interests of both parties, but if that be true, then let the sale of lands and franchises be in the hands of the Filipinos, who are the real owners and who would have to bear the consequences of any mistake.

Q. Does the Roman Catholic Church exercise a baneful influence upon the Filipinos?

LOPEZ. No. The church is not, and never has been, a baneful influence, but its influence for good is very materially impaired by the monks, who are a disgrace to the church and to the country from whence they came. To imagine that because the Filipinos are opposed to the monks they are therefore opposed to the church is altogether a mistake. The Filipinos are staunch Catholics, and the influence of the church itself can not be other than a good and blessed influence if administered by good men. But the present tacit support which is being given to these monks, who have outraged the teaching and everything that is beautiful in a church which it is their sacred duty to maintain, is a menace to its existence and a placing of the claims or property before those of religion in the Philippines. At present we have only one church and one creed, and whatever supposed defects the Protestant may see in that church, we should still prefer to have unity and peace, rather than a multiplicity of sects. We can not therefore look with favor upon missionary enterprise within our Christian communities. And if the Moros are to be turned from the error of their ways, it would be better that the change should be brought about by the Catholic Church in the Philippines.

Q. Would a form of government modeled on that of the United States be suitable for the Philippines?

LOPEZ. The constitution of Malolos was similar in many respects to the United States Constitution, and would have suited our people, subject to such modification as time and experience made necessary. It is, however, certain that the republican would be the only suitable form of government for the Philippines. We have had enough of despotism and government without the consent of the people. Representative government is the only real safeguard to individual liberty and purity of administration. But a constitutional convention—such as was convened in Cuba—could determine the actual details and make provision for all local conditions and necessities.

Q. What would be the effect of a definite promise of independence upon the present conditions in the islands?

LOPEZ. The effect would be to change the conditions in a manner in which they will never be changed without such a promise or intimation. At present there is discontent, distrust, and the bitter feeling of having been crushed by superior force. The peace thus achieved is not a permanent peace, nor is it a condition on which to found a stable government. It seems hardly necessary to tell Americans that stable government can rest only upon the recognized rights of the people. The promise of independence would have a similar effect, and would bring about a similar result to that secured in Cuba. Instead of the present soreness of heart there would be universal rejoicing throughout the islands. Instead of distrust there would be mutual confidence and a desire to join with America in the establishment of a government of the people. Instead of enforced submission there would be a sense of liberty and a sentiment of kindness and good will. The people would have what they most desire and would be willing to accord to America every concession or demand that she could reasonably make. A mantle of forgetfulness would be thrown over the misunderstandings and horrors of the past, and our country would begin a new era of peace and prosperity, hand in hand with its deliverer and friend.

The principles of democracy would be established in the ancient East, where despotism has reigned for thousands of years, and the bread of self-denial thus cast upon the waters would return in 10,000 ships to the giver of peace and liberty. The old bell of Independence Hall could be tolled once more, and Filipinos would come from afar to visit Concord and Lexington, and as the tears of gladness coursed down their cheeks they would know that the seeds of liberty thus planted had borne rich fruit after more than a hundred years.

Q. Will you please state what you know about the native language used in the Philippines?

LOPEZ. A number of erroneous statements have been made, and as a result the most absurd misapprehension exists in reference to the language of the Filipinos. It has been said, for instance, that there exists "a bewildering multiplicity of languages which are mutually unintelligible." All such statements have been made by men who do not speak or write or know anything about the native dialects, and whose knowledge of Spanish even is somewhat rudimentary. One can therefore judge how well these men are qualified to speak on such matters.

The facts of the case are as follows, and I challenge disproof of the statements which I am about to make.

Among the Christianized inhabitants of the Philippines—which comprise 90 to 95 per cent of the entire population—seven dialects are spoken, namely, Tagal (or Tagalog), Visayan, Bicol, Ilocano, Pangasinan, Pampangan, and Cagayan. The latter six of these dialects are modifications of and are very similar to the Tagal; so that in reality there is one language from which have arisen six dialects. In these statements I have the support of no less an authority than Prof. Aristide Marre, who is a member of the Royal Institute of The Hague and of the Society of Batavia, associate of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Turin, president of the Malay and Madagascar Section of the Twentieth Congress of Orientalists, held at Rome, 1899. In his "Tagalog Grammar" Professor Marre says: "There are no important differences in the various idioms spoken in the Philippines. The Visayan, Bicol, Ilocano, Pampangan, and Pangasinan have, as a common type, the Tagalog language, which is understood in the whole extent of that vast archipelago."

The difference between Tagal and Visayan or Bicol, etc., is less than the difference between Spanish and Portuguese or Italian.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand the Senator to be reading the statement of another person; but I should like to know at this point whether the Senator thinks that a Spaniard can communicate with an Italian.

Mr. CARMACK. I am not much of a scholar, and my friend from Indiana is. I hope he will not expose my ignorance by talking to me about foreign languages. I am one of the common people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. One of the common people, yes.

Mr. CARMACK. And have not the culture that pertains to men of his class. So I hope he will not get up here and expose my ignorance before the galleries just out of pure meanness.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. This is the first time I have ever heard a Senator refer to the galleries.

Mr. CARMACK. I knew when the Senator arose to ask me the question that it was for the benefit of the galleries.



Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, no; I was quite serious. If this is meant to mean anything, it is meant to mean that the Filipinos are a united people; it is attempted to be shown that they have a similar language; and the comparison is seriously made between the Spanish and Italian languages. I was asking the Senator, who was introducing this remarkable statement, whether he thought a Spaniard could communicate with an Italian or if a Viscayan could communicate with a Tagalog. If that be not the case, that part of the argument falls. I will state to the Senator that that inquiry is addressed to him and to the Senate, and not to the galleries.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I will simply have to make the confession that I do not speak Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian. I am not scholar enough to answer the question of the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will simply say, in the way of pleasantry between the Senator and myself, that I have been delighted to find the Senator on two occasions, when we were engaged in pleasant controversy, making two confessions, both of which I think were good for his soul.

Mr. CARMACK. I will simply say here that I am quoting from a witness who, I am inclined think, is a better educated man than either one of us.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Is he a Filipino?

Mr. CARMACK. Yes; it is Lopez.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That explains the Senator's belief.

Mr. CARMACK. Probably so; and the fact that the Senator is a Republican explains his.

Lopez continues:

Although I do not know Italian, I have found little difficulty in conversing with Italians.

He is a Spaniard; that is, he speaks Spanish. His education was in Spanish. He says, "Although I do not know Italian, I have found little difficulty in conversing with Italians."

Mr. President, while, as I said, I am not educated in these languages, I do know that Spanish and Portuguese are very closely akin, and that Spanish and Italian are closely akin. They are both offshoots of the Latin, one of the Romance languages.

Mr. TILLMAN. They are all Latin in their origin.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Since we have a contribution on the question of linguistic science from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], I should like to ask whether he thinks a Spaniard can speak Latin?

Mr. TILLMAN. Well, I will say in answer that a man's capacity to speak a language is born with him.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, because they are both derived from the Latin language, the inference is that the Spaniard can speak Italian and the Italian can speak Spanish.

Mr. CARMACK. It seems that anybody can speak what he pleases in my time. This testimony continues:

Indeed, at the Vatican, where I was mistaken for a Japanese, I was complimented on "being able to speak Italian so well." And similarly, when I visited the Visayan Islands and the Bicol provinces I found less difficulty in conversing with the inhabitants of those parts. A Tagal can become conversant with any of these dialects in a fortnight, and vice versa.

The following table of familiar words will serve to show the similarity and identity of Tagal and Visayan, which is the most widely spoken dialect in the islands:

English.	Tagal.	Visayan.
Yes.....	Oo (pronounced 5)	Oo (pronounced 5).
No.....	Hindi	Hindi.
I.....	Ako	Ako.
My, mine.....	Akin	Akun.
Me.....	Ako or akin	Ako or akun.
We.....	Kita	Kita.
Sun.....	Araw	Adlaw.
Moon.....	Buan	Bulan.
Star.....	Bituin	Bituon.
River.....	Ilog	Ilong.
Water.....	Tubig	Tubig.
Town.....	Bayan	Banua.
Eat.....	Kain	Kaun.
Count.....	Bilang	Bilang.
Divide.....	Bahagi	Bahagi.
Help.....	Tolong	Tolong.
Sweet.....	Matamis	Matamis.
Wet.....	Basa	Basa.
Dear (costly).....	Mahal	Mahal.
Thanks.....	Salamat	Salamat.
How are you?.....	Kamusta kayo?	Kamusta kamu?
One.....	Isa	Isa.
Two.....	Dalua	Dua.
Three.....	Tatlo	Tulo.
Four.....	Apat	Apat.
Five.....	Lima	Lima.
Six.....	Anin	Anun.
Seven.....	Pito	Pito.
Eight.....	Walo	Walo.
Nine.....	Siam	Siam.
Ten.....	Sampo	Pulo.

The grammatical construction of all the dialects is the same as that of the Tagal.

The difference in dialect between these several provincial peoples would not form a difficulty to independent self-government, first, because the difference is so slight, and, secondly, because Spanish is the official language of our country and is spoken by the educated people of all the provinces. Other countries do not find that a difference in language even forms a difficulty to self-government. In Austria three distinct languages are spoken; in Switzerland two languages and a local patois; in Belgium, two languages, and in Germany high and low German. Until recently there were Scottish Highlanders speaking Gaelic, and in Wales at the present time there are parts where the English language is unknown except to the educated few. In almost every self-governing country in the world two or more languages or dialects are spoken by the people; and the only difficulty in regard to language in any of these countries has been due to jealousy as to which language should become the official one. This difficulty has already been settled in the Philippines. But if language were a difficulty under Filipino rule it would be a difficulty under any other rule and a special difficulty under American rule, due to the necessity of introducing English, which would form a third language in our country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TILLMAN (to Mr. CARMACK). Ask that it be printed.

Mr. LODGE. Unless some other Senator desires to go on, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CARMACK. I desire to go on. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator from Tennessee insist that I shall not move an executive session until he has ceased to desire to go on? [Laughter.]

Mr. PATTERSON. I move to strike out the last section of the majority bill.

Mr. CARMACK (to Mr. PATTERSON). And shall I speak to that motion?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; speak to that.

Mr. LODGE. I do not understand that we have the House rule here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it has never been recognized by the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that the same rule which he recognized when I was upon the floor would be in order now. That was that the Senator could speak to another amendment provided no one else wished to speak.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator going on or having the document printed or doing anything he likes with it. I have no objection in the world—

Mr. MONEY. I will take the floor.

Mr. LODGE. But I thought if no Senator desired to speak—

Mr. MONEY. I do.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator could have it printed and the Senate could go into executive session, as several Senators have asked me to move such a session. But, of course, that motion is withdrawn if any Senator desires to speak.

Mr. CARMACK. I asked to have it printed and objection was made.

Mr. MONEY. I will take the floor on the pending amendment, and as I can not see to read, I will request the Senator from Tennessee to read the paper for my benefit.

Mr. BERRY. We have never done that here.

Mr. MONEY. There is objection raised to having it read through a substitute. I can not read it myself or I would do it. I do not see why some Democrat does not take the floor and read it himself.

Mr. PATTERSON. Or ask the Secretary to read it.

Mr. MONEY. Or ask the Secretary to read it. As the Senator from Indiana interjected his remarks about languages to a degree which prevented the Senator from Tennessee finishing his remarks, it seems to me there should be no objection to this request. Some one in an indirect way should get before the Senate what the Senator from Tennessee desires to place there. But I will withdraw the request. [To Mr. BERRY.] Do you want to have an executive session?

Mr. BERRY. I do not. The only reason I made the aside remark to the Senator from Mississippi was this: Since I have been in the Senate it has never been the practice, after a unanimous agreement had been made, to move to strike out the last word in order to extend the time. I objected this morning to the Senator from Ohio doing that thing, when he made the proposition, and for that reason only. If the Senator desires to do it, I make no objection.

Mr. MONEY. I made no amendment whatever. I have spoken to the pending amendment. I did not move to strike out anything. My intention was to have the article read which was begun by the Senator from Tennessee, and as I can not see to read it myself I asked to have him read it for me. But I would just as soon have the Secretary read it. I will therefore ask that the Secretary read it in my time, as I am unable to do it.

I wish to say frankly that I do not desire to hear it, but as there was an interruption which seemed to me without any adequate cause, I want to hear it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Q. Can you give any evidence of friendly relations existing between the peoples speaking these several dialects?

LOPEZ. I can only give such facts as occur to me, for I never dreamt that it would be necessary to prove the nonexistence of the alleged tribal animosities that have been charged against the Filipinos. The idea of these provincial or tribal animosities never arose with the Filipinos or with anyone else prior to the conflict with America. It was born in the imagination of those in search of difficulties to Filipino self-government. It is the duty, therefore, of those who make the assertion to furnish the proof, and it is certain that if proof had existed it would have been brought forth long ago, instead of the bald assertions of those who do not understand our people and who have reached conclusions in no way warranted by facts.

Nevertheless, though it is not my duty to prove a negative, I can mention some things which go to prove that friendly relations do indeed exist between the several provincial peoples.

When our government was first established emissaries came from almost all the provinces and islands, declaring their support on behalf of those from whom they came. Even the Moros of Mindanao and the Igorrotes, who had never been subdued by Spain, acclaimed Aguinaldo and were prepared to recognize his government. Our assembly or representative chamber, under the new constitution, comprised representatives from all the provinces. Of these 110 representatives about one-third were elected by the people with the electoral machinery then existing for the election of petty governors, etc. About two-thirds were first appointed by Aguinaldo and his advisers to represent the then unorganized provinces, and many of these were subsequently elected by the people, the remainder holding office by tacit consent until elections could be held. From these facts have arisen the charge that Aguinaldo appointed all the representatives.

The interrelations of the people of the several provincial districts show that no tribal enmity existed. In the schools and colleges, especially in Manila, there are representatives of all the provincial peoples, but it would be impossible to tell which were which. And although there is considerable rivalry among the students, this rivalry is not between Visayans, Tagals, Bicolis, etc.

There are several institutions in the Philippines, the benefits of which are not confined to the people of any one province. For example, there was an educational institution (purely Filipino) granting scholarships which enabled the winners to study in Europe. These scholarships were open to all Filipinos in the archipelago.

In Japan the official representative of the so-called "Tagalog despotism" was an Ilocano. In Madrid all the Filipinos resident there formed themselves into a committee and worked untidily for independence. The president of this committee was a Bicol, the vice-president was an Ilocano, the secretary a Visayan, the treasurer a Tagal, and the remainder of the committee were Visayans, Bicolis, Tagals, Pangasinans, and Ilocanos. In Barcelona, in Paris, and in London the same diversity of province and the same unanimity of purpose obtained. All this represented the universal attitude of the Filipinos in a state of peace. In war, where there was every opportunity for tribal enmity to show itself had it existed, there was the same unity of purpose, the same interrelations between the several provincial peoples. The generals, officers, and rank and file who supported Aguinaldo were representative of all the provinces. There were Visayan generals commanding Tagal troops, and vice versa. There were composite regiments officered by Bicolis, Ilocanos, Tagals, Visayans, etc.

Lucban is a Bicol who commanded the Visayans in Samar, and included in his command were Tagals and Bicolis. Delgado is a Visayan who commanded Tagals and Visayans in Panay. Ricarte, an Ilocano, was in command of Tagals in Nueva Ecija. Tino, a Tagal, commanded Ilocanos in Ilocos. Concepcion, a Visayan from Iloilo, was on Aguinaldo's personal staff. Villamor and several of his relatives, all Ilocanos, were officers under Aguinaldo. Ison and Dicon, Pampangans, and Leyba, a Tagal-Spanish mestizo, commanded composite regiments of Tagals, Pangasinans, Bicolis, Pampangans, and Cagayans. Even the Igorrotes were fighting in many regiments under Aguinaldo. There has been fighting against America in every part of the archipelago with the exception of the Sulu Islands, and the fight has been for the independence of the Philippines. Can it be believed that those who were fighting for a single end against a common foe were split up by racial animosities?

As a matter of fact, with the exception of the Moros of central Mindanao and the Sulus and the Igorrotes and Negritos and a few relatively unimportant mountain peoples, the Filipinos are a homogeneous, Christianized people, practicing the morals and arts of civilization, united in the desire for independence and for the purpose of maintaining a stable independent government.

Q. How do the Filipinos regard the introduction of English and the use of English as a teaching medium in elementary schools?

LOPEZ. I should be the last to say anything against a useful reform, and especially against anything in the way of education, but I can not help thinking that to make English a teaching medium in elementary and infant schools in a country where not a tenth per cent of the people speak English is a waste of energy and calculated to retard the progress of education in the islands. Undoubtedly there are many Filipinos who, for commercial purposes, desire to learn English. There are also many students who desire to become acquainted with the avenues of English literature. If English were taught in the high schools and colleges, these desires would be sufficiently provided for. But to teach English to children who may never make use of it, or to make English the medium for teaching children who speak an entirely different language in their homes and in every walk of life is as valueless as it is futile. Why does America try to "rush" things in this way? Perhaps in the distant future, by teaching English in the high schools and colleges, and by commercial intercourse with English-speaking peoples, the Filipinos might accept English as the official or universal language of the country. But to force English upon infants with the object of Anglicizing the Filipinos is about as wise as it would be to teach a school of parrots to say the Lord's prayer with the object of Christianizing the whole feathered tribe.

It may look well on paper to send a thousand teachers to the "benighted" Filipinos. At a time when so much evil is being done it may be well to do (apparently) a little good. But I want to tell the American people that we have thousands of capable teachers in the Philippines who would undertake to work at less than half the cost of the American teachers now being sent to the islands, that we have had for the last thirty or forty years two large normal schools in Manila for the training of male and female teachers, and that we are capable of conducting our own educational affairs. Undoubtedly we are anxious to learn from America and other countries all that is new and good in their educational systems, but this should be done by sending out Filipino teachers and by securing the services of a few experts from these countries to teach in the normal schools. This would be more effective and more economical than employing thousands of teachers, who naturally will not go to the Philippines unless they are paid abnormal salaries.

Q. Can you give any facts about the land tax imposed by the civil government in the Philippines?

LOPEZ. The land tax has not been made operative in the provinces under military rule, and so, as my own province of Batangas has been under military rule, I can not speak from experience in reference to this tax. But I have conversed with a number of Filipinos who are strongly opposed to the imposition of the land tax under present circumstances. The contention is that to impose a land tax at a time when the country has been impoverished by rinderpest and when the land is producing practically nothing would be to compel the Filipinos to sell their lands to speculators—presumably foreign speculators. I have already said that to alienate the public lands under present conditions would be most unfair and unjust. But if to this is added the forced sale of private property the injustice will be tenfold. At present our own plantations in Batangas are being worked to a very limited extent with the object of trying to keep them in order, and they are not paying their way. Before any substantial return can be expected working animals will have to be provided, and crops planted and harvested. If we had no other sources of income, and if we were, nevertheless, compelled to pay a land tax, the hardship would be very great. I believe that the agricultural industry in Batangas will not be restored to its former condition for another ten years, and what is true of Batangas is true of most of the other provinces of the islands. It will therefore be necessary to give every encouragement and aid to agriculture, which is the chief industry of the islands, and I can not conceive that the imposition of a land tax, under conditions of abnormal impoverishment, would aid agriculture. It is certain that the Filipinos would not impose a land tax under present circumstances if they were governing themselves.

In the Schurman Commission's proclamation of three years ago, which was intended to induce the Filipinos to cease resistance to American authority, it was stated that "with such a prudent and honest fiscal administration it is believed that the needs of the government will in a short time become compatible with a considerable reduction in taxation." This was a prophecy that we never believed, and we have found ample justification for our skepticism. At the present time taxation is heavier than it ever was in Spanish days, and the cost of living, in the towns and cities at least, has been increased about fourfold. These are facts that ought to be remembered when the statement is made that the Filipinos are now earning double what they earned in former times.

It can not be denied that the present government is a very costly one especially in view of the fact that only the most urgent public necessities are being provided for. What the taxation would be if provision were being made for all public requirements and for necessary public works it is appalling to contemplate. Undoubtedly such heavy taxation under the present impoverished conditions can only result in a transfer of the real estate of the Filipinos into the hands of foreign speculators.

Will not Congress come to our aid in these matters? America has the power and has used the power to deny us our own government with the consent of our own people. Power entails a corresponding responsibility, and those who use the power ought to see to it that a great injustice shall not be done to those whose power of self-protection has been taken away.

SIXTO LOPEZ.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MONEY. The Secretary has not completed the reading of the paper.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has completed the reading of the first paper sent up by the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. I sent up another one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONEY. I am sorry that I could not finish these remarks this evening. I shall try to get them in to-morrow.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3360) for the promotion of First Lieut. Joseph M. Simms, Revenue-Cutter Service, disagreed to by the Senate, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HEPBURN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ADAMSON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution, tendering the thanks of Congress to Hon. John Hay for the appropriate memorial address delivered by him on the life and services of William McKinley, late President of the United States; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2276) to fix the time of holding the circuit and district court for the southern district of West Virginia;

A bill (S. 2510) extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacana, S. Dak.;

A bill (H. R. 357) for the relief of Levi Maxted;

A bill (H. R. 2901) to remove the charge of desertion borne opposite the name of Abram Williams;

A bill (H. R. 7319) granting an increase of pension to Frances H. Anthony;

A bill (H. R. 8752) authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house and jail for said county;

A bill (H. R. 13359) making appropriation for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes;



A bill (H. R. 14018) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 91) providing for the publication of 50,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle.

#### RECALL OF BILLS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration. It is for the recall from the House of Representatives of certain bills which are included in the omnibus claims bill.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bills (S. 20) for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack, (S. 21) for the relief of John S. Neet, jr., and (S. 22) for the relief of Ezra S. Havens.

#### MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE PRESIDENT M'KINLEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the thanks of Congress be presented to Hon. John Hay for the appropriate memorial address delivered by him on the life and services of William McKinley, late President of the United States, in the Representatives' Hall, before both Houses of Congress and their invited guests, on the 27th day of February, 1902, and that he be requested to furnish a copy for publication.

*Resolved*, That the chairman of the joint committee appointed to make the necessary arrangements to carry into effect the resolutions of this Congress in relation to the memorial exercises in honor of William McKinley be requested to communicate to Mr. Hay the foregoing resolution, receive his answer thereto, and present the same to both Houses of Congress.

Mr. KEAN. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], who was chairman of the committee on the part of the Senate, I suppose would like to have the concurrent resolution referred.

Mr. COCKRELL. I thought the Senate had passed such a resolution and sent it to the House.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate passed one long ago.

Mr. COCKRELL. How did this get here?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a House concurrent resolution which has just been laid before the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not the resolution passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then I suggest that it be printed and lie on the table until the Senator from Ohio comes in, as he had charge of the matter, I believe.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. If no one desires to continue on the Philippine government bill, as it is now nearly 5 o'clock, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1902, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1902.*

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

George W. Bibee, of Sheridan, Oreg., to be receiver of public moneys at Oregon City, Oreg., vice William Galloway, term expired.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY—GENERAL OFFICERS.

##### To be brigadier-generals.

Col. Samuel M. Whiteside, Tenth Cavalry, May 29, 1902, vice Harbach, retired from active service.

Col. Sumner H. Lincoln, Tenth Infantry, May 29, 1902, vice Spurgin, retired from active service.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### Infantry Arm.

Lieut. Col. William Quinton, Fourteenth Infantry, to be colonel, May 28, 1902, vice Harbach, First Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Lieut. Col. Jesse C. Chance, Twenty-sixth Infantry, to be colonel, May 28, 1902, vice Spurgin, Fourth Infantry, appointed brigadier-general, United States Army.

Maj. Ralph W. Hoyt, Tenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, May 28, 1902, vice Quinton, Fourteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. George A. Cornish, Fifteenth Infantry, to be lieutenant-colonel, May 28, 1902, vice Chance, Twenty-sixth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Charles H. Bonesteel, Twenty-seventh Infantry, to be major (subject to examination required by law), May 9, 1902, vice James, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Lyman W. V. Kennon, Sixth Infantry, to be major (sub-

ject to examination required by law), May 28, 1902, vice Hoyt, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. William Lassiter, Sixteenth Infantry, to be major, May 28, 1902, vice Cornish, Fifteenth Infantry, promoted.

Capt. Charles G. Morton, Sixth Infantry, to be major (subject to examination required by law), May 28, 1902, vice McCammon, Sixth Infantry, retired from active service.

First Lieut. George F. Baltzell, Fifth Infantry, to be captain, May 9, 1902, vice Bonesteel, Twenty-seventh Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Edgar T. Conley, Twenty-first Infantry, to be captain, May 26, 1902, vice Russell, Eighth Infantry, deceased.

First Lieut. Edgar T. Collins, Eighth Infantry, to be captain, May 28, 1902, vice Kennon, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Seaborn G. Chiles, Eleventh Infantry, to be captain, May 28, 1902, vice Lassiter, Sixteenth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Lyman M. Welch, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain, May 28, 1902, vice Morton, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter J. Manion, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of April, 1902, vice Lieut. John L. Purcell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George E. Gelm, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of April, 1902, vice Lieut. Robert F. Lopez, promoted.

Asst. Surg. Francis M. Furlong, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 16th day of September, 1901, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1902.*

##### POSTMASTERS.

Conrey M. Ingman, to be postmaster at Marysville, in the county of Union and State of Ohio.

Allan Graham, jr., to be postmaster at Ottawa, in the county of Putnam and State of Ohio.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1902.*

##### CONSUL.

Alfred K. Moe, of New Jersey, to be consul of the United States at Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

##### SECRETARY OF LEGATION AND CONSUL-GENERAL.

Edward L. Adams, of New York, to be secretary of legation and consul-general of the United States at Stockholm, Sweden, to take effect June 2, 1902.

##### SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Charles Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be third secretary of the embassy of the United States at Berlin, Germany, from July 1, 1902.

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Frank W. Tucker, of Arkansas, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Arkansas.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

##### Artillery Corps.

Charles F. Donnohue, of Indiana, late first lieutenant, One hundred and fifty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

William B. Brister, of New Jersey, late first lieutenant, Fourth New Jersey Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Roger O. Mason, of Delaware, late second lieutenant, First Delaware Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Harrie F. Reed, of New York, late second lieutenant, Two hundred and first New York Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Walter C. Baker, of Pennsylvania, late sergeant, Company C, Sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Charles A. Clark, of Illinois, late sergeant, Company I, Fourth Illinois Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Avery J. Cooper, of Oregon, late private, Company L, Second Oregon Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Robert Davis, of New York, late first sergeant, Company F, Two hundred and first New York Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Frank Geere, of Wyoming, late sergeant, Company G, First Wyoming Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Natt F. Jamieson, of Vermont, late sergeant, Company L, Twenty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers (now private, Company C, First Battalion of Engineers, United States Army), September 23, 1901.

Richard I. McKenney, of Minnesota, late private, Company C, Thirteenth Minnesota Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Nelson E. Margetts, of Utah, late corporal, Battery A, Utah Volunteer Artillery, September 23, 1901.

John V. Spring, of Texas, late sergeant, Company I, First Texas Volunteer Cavalry, September 23, 1901.

Sergt. Emmett R. Harris, Troop L, Eighth Cavalry, United States Army, to be second lieutenant, September 23, 1901.

Frederick E. Gignoux, of Nevada, late first lieutenant, Eleventh Cavalry, United States Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Guy B. G. Hanna, of Iowa, late sergeant, Company D, Porto Rico Regiment, United States Volunteer Infantry, September 23, 1901.

George P. Hawes, jr., of Virginia, late private, Company A, First Cavalry, United States Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Andrew W. Jackman, of Illinois, late private, Company F, First Illinois Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

George L. Wertenbaker, of Virginia, late sergeant, Company D, Third Virginia Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

Richard P. Winslow, of Mississippi, late corporal, Company F, First Tennessee Volunteers, September 23, 1901.

#### *Cavalry Arm.*

Hamilton Bowie, of Alabama, late first lieutenant, Fortieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901.

Thomas E. Cathro, of Indiana, late corporal, Company D, One hundred and fifty-eighth Indiana Volunteers, February 2, 1901.

#### *Infantry Arm.*

Algernon E. Sartoris, of the District of Columbia, May 22, 1902.

Charles A. Hunt, of New Hampshire, May 22, 1902.

Leo B. Dannemiller, of Ohio, May 22, 1902.

Harry Griffin Leckie, of Virginia, May 22, 1902.

Claire R. Bennett, of Washington, May 22, 1902.

Charles Wells, of Pennsylvania, May 22, 1902.

Robert O. Ragsdale, of Tennessee, late first lieutenant, Thirty-seventh Infantry, United States Volunteers, February 2, 1901.

Augustus F. Dannemiller, of Ohio, late private, Company I, Eighth Ohio Volunteers, February 2, 1901.

#### MEDICAL OFFICER OF VOLUNTEERS.

Francis J. Bailey, of Oregon, contract surgeon, United States Army, to be assistant surgeon, United States Volunteers, with the rank of captain, May 26, 1902.

#### POSTMASTERS.

James P. Fitch, to be postmaster at Morgantown, in the county of Monongalia and State of West Virginia.

John P. S. Fenstermacher, to be postmaster at Kutztown, in the county of Berks and State of Pennsylvania.

William Goodin, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa.

Giles P. Lecrenier, to be postmaster at Moodus, in the county of Middlesex and State of Connecticut.

John W. Wilson, to be postmaster at Del Norte, in the county of Rio Grande and State of Colorado.

Harry L. Bras, to be postmaster at Mitchell, in the county of Davison and State of South Dakota.

Joseph A. West, to be postmaster at Provincetown, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

Thomas A. Hills, to be postmaster at Leominster, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Alexander Y. Jones, to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania.

Rueben K. Sawyer, to be postmaster at Wellesley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Olive L. Stauffer, to be postmaster at Gladbrook, in the county of Tama and State of Iowa.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, June 2, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 29, 1902, was read, corrected, and approved.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. I also present the statement of the House managers.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio presents the statement of the conferees on the part of the House on the river and harbor bill, which will be printed in the RECORD in accordance with the rule.

Mr. BURTON. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen will state it.

Mr. BURTON. The conference report is quite voluminous and it has already been printed in the RECORD of the Senate proceedings of Wednesday, May 28. I desire to ask if it is necessary to repeat the printing of that report, which is exactly the same, except the order in which the names of the conferees are signed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the printing of a report in the RECORD under the proceedings of either House is a compliance with the rule recently adopted.

Mr. BURTON. I further give notice that I shall seek to bring up this report for action to-morrow.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAYNE. Referring to the conference report on the river and harbor bill, I suppose that unless the House takes some action the report will be printed in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that he obtain unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair held that the report having been printed in the proceedings of the Senate, that would be a compliance with the new rule. The gentleman from Ohio has filed the statement for the purpose of having that printed.

Mr. PAYNE. The statement and not the report.

The SPEAKER. Not the report, that having been printed already.

The statement of the House conferees is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12346) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the changes proposed by Senate amendments, 207 in number, and of the effect of the action recommended in the conference report published in the RECORD of the Senate proceedings for May 28, 1902, on each of said amendments, namely:

(In amendments describing items for expenditure upon projects not in the House bill the word "appropriation" is used. In case of increase of House items the word "addition" is employed.)

No. 1: Breakwater, Mount Desert to Porcupine Island, Maine: Appropriation of \$25,000; Senate recedes.

No. 2: Bucksport Harbor, Maine: Appropriation of \$20,000; House concurs.

No. 3: Little Harbor, New Hampshire: Appropriation of \$13,000; House concurs.

No. 4: Hendersons Point, near navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Appropriation of \$749,000, cash and authorization; Senate recedes.

No. 5: Sandy Bay Harbor of Refuge, Massachusetts: Verbal amendment; House concurs.

No. 6: Harbor at Manchester, Mass.: Appropriation of \$5,000; House concurs.

No. 7: Cohasset, Mass.: Addition of \$11,000; Senate recedes.

No. 8: Scituate, Mass.: Appropriation of \$15,000; Senate recedes.

No. 9: Plymouth and Provincetown, Mass.: Deduction of \$5,700; House concurs.

No. 10: Provision for certain examinations; Senate recedes, provided for elsewhere.

No. 11: Point Judith Harbor of Refuge, Rhode Island: Appropriation of \$100,000; House concurs, with verbal amendment.

No. 12: Harbors of refuge at Block Island and Great Salt Pond, Rhode Island, and entrance to Point Judith Pond: Addition of \$15,000 for Block Island; House concurs. Appropriation of \$90,000 for Great Salt Pond; House concurs in \$50,000. Appropriation of \$15,000 for Point Judith Pond; Senate recedes. Provision for surveys retained as in House bill.

No. 13: Milford, Conn.: Addition of \$10,000; House concurs.

Nos. 14 to 18, inclusive: Mattituck, N. Y.: Appropriation of \$10,000; Senate recedes. Appropriation of \$10,000 for Sag Harbor; House concurs, with an amendment grouping Sag Harbor with other harbors on Long Island.

No. 19: Buttermilk Channel, New York Harbor: Appropriation of \$200,000; House concurs in \$90,000.

No. 20: Raritan Bay, New Jersey: Verbal amendment; House concurs.

No. 21: Curtis Bay, Baltimore Harbor, Maryland: Appropriation of \$50,000 cash and \$148,000 authorization; House concurs.

No. 22: Harbors and rivers on the easterly shore of Chesapeake Bay, Maryland: Addition of \$14,000; House concurs.

No. 23: Cape Charles City, Va.: Addition of \$10,000; House concurs.

No. 24: Charleston Harbor, South Carolina: Authorization for the expenditure of unappropriated balance of amount heretofore authorized for former project; House concurs.

No. 25: Inland waterway between Charleston, S. C., and opposite McClellanville: Appropriation of \$50,000; House concurs.

No. 26: Brunswick Harbor, Georgia: Addition of \$25,000; House concurs.

No. 27: Brunswick Harbor, Georgia: Formal amendment; House concurs.

No. 28: Biscayne Bay, Florida: Appropriation of \$150,000 cash, also \$466,667 authorization; House concurs in \$50,000 cash and \$250,000 authorization.

No. 29: Key West, Fla.: Formal amendment; House concurs.

No. 30: Pensacola, Fla.: Designation of width of channel; House concurs.

No. 31: Pensacola, Fla.: Addition of \$25,000; Senate recedes.

No. 32: Mobile Bay, Alabama: Authorization to expend \$50,000 upon channel through outer bar; House concurs.

No. 33: Biloxi, Miss.: Appropriation of \$10,000; House concurs.

No. 34: Calcasieu River, Louisiana: Addition of \$40,000; House concurs.

Nos. 35 and 36: Sabine Pass, Texas and Louisiana: Change in phraseology; House concurs in No. 35 with an amendment, and Senate recedes from No. 36.

No. 37: Brazos River Channel and Dock Company: Addition of \$400,000; Senate recedes.

No. 38: Galveston Harbor: Provision for turning basin; Senate recedes.

Nos. 39 and 40: Galveston Harbor: Authorization for change in plan of south jetty; House concurs.

No. 41: Galveston Channel, inner harbor: Appropriation of \$200,000 cash, also \$400,000 authorization; House concurs in \$100,000 cash and \$200,000 authorization, with change in designation of the improvement to be made.

No. 42: Amendment directing examination of property of the United States; House concurs.

No. 43: Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio: Addition of \$65,000; House concurs.

No. 44: Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: Verbal amendment; substitution of another paragraph.

No. 45: Huron, Ohio: Addition of \$15,000; House concurs.

No. 46: Sagatuck Harbor, Michigan: Additional authorization of \$135,000; House concurs in \$100,000.

No. 47: Marquette, Mich.: Authorization for expenditure of part of appropriation on Presque Isle breakwater; House concurs.

Nos. 48 and 49: Menominee Harbor and River, Michigan and Wisconsin: Addition of \$50,000 and recognition of new project; House concurs.

No. 50: Ahnapee, Port Washington, and Oconto, Wis.: Addition of \$5,000; House concurs, with the addition of a formal amendment.



- No. 51: Sheboygan, Wis.: Formal amendment; House concurs.
- Nos. 52 and 53: Duluth, Minn., and Superior, Wis.: Deduction of \$75,000, and omission of provision for a dredge; House concurs.
- No. 54: Warroad Harbor and River, Minnesota: Appropriation of \$45,000; House concurs.
- No. 55: Oakland Harbor, California: Addition of \$368,203 authorization; House concurs in \$150,000.
- No. 56: Coos Bay and Harbor, Oregon: Addition of \$85,000; House concurs in \$40,000.
- No. 57: Tacoma Harbor, Washington: Addition of \$222,000 authorization; House concurs in \$100,000.
- No. 58: Tacoma Harbor, Washington: Deposition of dredged material. Verbal amendment; House concurs with an amendment.
- No. 59: New Whatcom Harbor, Washington: Addition of \$25,000; Senate recedes, but this amount is added to the appropriation for Puget Sound and tributary waters.
- Nos. 60 and 61: Waterway connecting Puget Sound with Lakes Union and Washington; change in phraseology; Senate recedes from No. 60, and House concurs in No. 61 with an amendment.
- No. 62: San Luis d'Apra, Island of Guam: Appropriation of \$150,000; Senate recedes.
- Nos. 63 and 64: Kennebec River, Maine: Addition of \$30,000 cash appropriation and \$41,000 authorization; House concurs.
- No. 65: Connecticut River: Survey between Hartford and Holyoke; formal amendment; House concurs with an amendment.
- No. 66: Hudson River: Authority to change line of channel near city of Troy; House concurs with amendment. Provision for a survey with reference to gorges and freshets, given as an amendment, numbered 186, is inserted here.
- No. 67: Wappinger Creek, New York: Appropriation of \$1,500; House concurs.
- No. 68: Rancocas River, New Jersey: Appropriation of \$3,000; House concurs.
- No. 69: Mantua Creek, New Jersey: Addition of \$15,000; House concurs in \$10,000.
- No. 70: Allegheny River at Natrona, Pa.: Appropriation and authorization of \$239,022; Senate recedes.
- No. 71: Susquehanna River, Maryland: Verbal change; House concurs.
- No. 72: Elk River, Maryland: Appropriation of \$16,035; House concurs.
- No. 73: Anacostia River, District of Columbia: Appropriation of \$150,000; House concurs, with an amendment limiting the scope of the improvement.
- No. 74: Pagan River, Virginia: Appropriation of \$10,870; House concurs.
- No. 75: James River, Virginia: Addition of \$50,000, and extension of locality in which improvement is to be made; House concurs, with an amendment.
- No. 76: Appomattox River, Virginia: Addition of \$25,000 cash appropriation and \$175,000 authorization, with recognition of new project; House concurs.
- No. 77: Cape Fear River, North Carolina: Appropriation of \$150,000; House concurs in \$50,000, with an amendment.
- No. 78: Fishing Creek, North Carolina: Appropriation of \$2,000; House concurs.
- No. 79: Survey Norfolk Harbor, Virginia, to Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina: Formal nonconcurrence, but provision for examination and survey is made as a substitute for amendment numbered 187 in the list of examinations and surveys.
- No. 80: Ashley River, South Carolina: Appropriation of \$25,000; Senate recedes.
- No. 81: Oconee River, Georgia: Addition of \$10,000; House concurs.
- No. 82: Coosa River, Georgia and Alabama, locks and dams: Appropriation of \$75,000 cash and \$199,845 authorization; Senate recedes.
- Nos. 83 and 84: Coosa River, Georgia and Alabama: Addition of \$10,000, of which \$5,000 is added for the Oostenaulla and Coosawattee Rivers; House concurs.
- No. 85: Appropriation for inside water route between Savannah and Fernandina, \$15,000; House concurs, with amendments making more general the locality in which the improvement is to be made.
- No. 86: Indian River, Florida, between Goat Creek and Jupiter Inlet: Appropriation of \$2,000; House concurs.
- No. 87: Escambia and Conecuh rivers, Florida: Designation of locality of improvement; House concurs, with amendment.
- Nos. 88 and 89: Water hyacinths: Appropriation made available for the State of Texas as well as for the States of Florida and Louisiana.
- No. 90: Withlacoochee River, Florida, from mouth to loading pool in the Gulf of Mexico: Appropriation of \$25,000; House concurs in \$15,000.
- No. 91: St. Johns River, Florida: Formal amendment; House concurs.
- No. 92: Tombigbee River, between Demopolis, Ala., and Columbus, Miss.: Provision for survey; Senate recedes.
- No. 93: Pascagoula River, Mississippi: Appropriation of \$50,000 cash and authorization for \$250,000; House concurs in \$25,000 cash and \$125,000 authorization.
- No. 94: Sabine and Neches rivers, Texas: Addition of \$46,000; House concurs.
- No. 96: Galveston Ship Channel and Buffalo Bayou, Texas; House concurs, with amendment retaining and making more clear the provision as contained in the House provision.
- No. 97: Trinity River, Texas: Addition of \$25,000 cash and \$150,000 authorization; House concurs in cash addition of \$25,000 and \$25,000 authorization.
- No. 98: Change in amount authorized to be expended for canal in West Galveston Bay; Senate recedes.
- No. 99: Upper White River, Arkansas: Addition of \$200,000; House concurs.
- No. 100: Levee, Walnut Bend, Ark.: Appropriation of \$90,000; House concurs.
- No. 101: Tennessee River: Diverting a portion of appropriation for maintenance between Chattanooga and Riverton; Senate recedes.
- No. 102: Cumberland River, Tennessee: Addition of \$95,000; House concurs, with an amendment providing for completion of Lock and Dam No. 1.
- No. 103: Cumberland River: Lease for water power may be granted to highest responsible bidder, whether owner of abutting land or not; House concurs.
- Nos. 104 and 105: Big Sandy River and Tug and Levisa forks of the same, West Virginia and Kentucky: Appropriation of \$250,000 cash and authorization of \$250,000; House concurs in \$175,000 cash and \$175,000 authorization.
- No. 106: Ohio River: Provision for improvement of levee at Shawneetown, Ill.; concurred in, provided improvement is required in the interest of navigation.
- No. 107: Ohio River: Site for lock and dam No. 7; appropriation of \$23,000; House concurs.
- No. 108: Ohio River: Appropriation for site for lock and dam No. 19, \$25,000; House concurs.
- No. 109: Saginaw River and tributary streams: Increase of diversion for Flint, Shiawassee, and Bad rivers from \$5,000 to \$12,500; House concurs.
- No. 110: Flint River, Michigan: Added to streams tributary to Saginaw River appropriated for; House concurs, with amendment.
- Nos. 111 and 112: Michigan-Lake Superior Power Company, of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.: Changes in paragraphing; House concurs.
- No. 113: International Commission: Great Lakes and tributary waters: Reduction of amount for compensation and expenses from \$25,000 to \$20,000; House concurs.
- No. 114: Verbal amendment; House concurs.
- No. 115: Grand River, Michigan: Addition of \$25,000 and change of limit of improvement; House concurs.
- No. 116: Strikes out provision for Miller Bay, Wisconsin; Senate recedes.
- No. 117: Minnesota River, Minnesota: Conditional appropriation for removal of the dam at the mouth of, \$2,500; House concurs.
- No. 118: Fox River, Illinois: Affirmative expression that permission grants no release from liability for damages; House concurs.
- Nos. 119, 120, and 121: Change taking from the Mississippi River Commission survey of certain portions of Illinois and other rivers; Senate recedes.
- Nos. 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, and 128: Addition of \$570,000 cash and \$150,000 authorization for the Mississippi River below Cairo, separating amounts for harbors on the Lower Mississippi from general appropriation for the river; House concurs in adoption of \$250,000 cash and \$150,000 authorization, amounts for harbors to be taken from general appropriation.
- No. 125: Sawyers Bend, in the harbor of St. Louis, Mississippi River: Diversion of \$50,000 for work already done; House concurs, provided the improvement was required in the interest of navigation.
- Nos. 129 and 130: Missouri River: Addition of \$320,000, and includes the words "continuing improvement" in describing the work to be done; House concurs in addition of \$195,000 and in designation of work.
- No. 131: Dams and reservoirs at Lake Kampeska and other places, South Dakota: Appropriation of \$2,500; Senate recedes.
- No. 132: Stockton and Mormon channels, Stockton, Cal.: Appropriation of \$50,000 cash and \$175,000 authorization; House concurs.
- No. 133: Columbia River at the Cascades, Oregon: Provision for the removal of rock; House concurs.
- No. 134: Addition of \$15,000 for Upper Columbia and Snake rivers, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, to be used in the portion of the Snake above Lewiston; House concurs.
- No. 135: Snake River: Change in provision designating more specifically the locality in which work is to be done.
- No. 136: Columbia River at The Dalles, Oregon and Washington: Makes available unexpended balance appropriated for ship railway and authorizes appropriation of \$400,000; House concurs, except authorization is diminished to \$100,000, with an amendment providing that a further survey shall be made by a board of engineers.
- No. 137: Columbia River at Vancouver, Wash.: Appropriation of \$18,000; House concurs in \$2,000.
- No. 138: Sinuslaw River, Oregon: Addition of \$9,000; House concurs.
- No. 139: Willapa River and Harbor, Washington: Amendment in spelling; House concurs.
- Nos. 140, 141, and 142: Puget Sound and tributary waters, Washington: Addition of \$5,000 by Senate, which amount is added to the sum to be available for removing the log jam in Nooksack River and authorizing the cutting of a new channel; House concurs and authorizes a transfer of \$15,000 added for New Whatcom Harbor, Washington.
- No. 143: Okanogan and Pend Oreille rivers, Washington: Addition by Senate of \$12,500; House concurs.
- No. 144: Preliminary examinations, surveys, etc.: Addition by Senate of \$50,000; House concurs.
- No. 145: International Commission: Verbal amendment; House concurs.
- No. 146: Repeal of provision for certain projects: Cypress Bayou, Texas and Louisiana; omitted from repealed items; House concurs.
- No. 147: Striking out option to punish by imprisonment in certain cases; Senate recedes.
- No. 148: Provision for 1,000 copies of an index to reports of the Chief of Engineers; House concurs.
- No. 149: Option to the Secretary of War to require bonds from a surety company; Senate recedes.
- No. 150: Authorizing the Secretary of War to extend time for completion of bridges without action by Congress; Senate recedes.
- No. 151: Verbal change in numbers; Senate recedes.
- The following pertain to provisions for examinations and surveys:
- No. 152: Fish River: Designation of locality; House concurs.
- No. 153: Belvedere Harbor in San Francisco Bay, California; House concurs.
- No. 154: Smyrna River, Delaware; Senate recedes.
- No. 155: Wilmington, Del.; Senate recedes.
- No. 156: Entrance to St. Andrews Bay, Florida; House concurs.
- No. 157: Volusia Bar and Lake Monroe Bar, Florida; Senate recedes.
- No. 158: Naples Harbor, Florida; Senate recedes.
- No. 159: Key West, Fla.; House concurs.
- No. 160: Skidaway Narrows, Georgia: Change in phraseology; Senate recedes.
- No. 161: Club and Plantation Creeks: House concurs.
- No. 162: Harbor at Mound City, Ill., on Ohio River; House concurs, with amendment limiting examination to interests of navigation.
- No. 163: Ohio River from Mound City, Ill., to Cairo, Ill.; same as last.
- No. 164: Chicago River, Illinois: For turning basins; Senate recedes.
- No. 165: East bank Mississippi River, near Quincy, Ill.; House concurs.
- No. 166: Ohio River: Dam below the mouth of Salt River, Indiana, and Kentucky; Senate recedes.
- No. 167: Sand Island, in the Ohio River, Indiana and Kentucky; House concurs.
- No. 168: Pond River, Kentucky; House concurs.
- No. 169: Tennants Harbor, Maine; Senate recedes.
- No. 170: Cape Small Harbor, Maine; House concurs.
- No. 171: Channel from Patapsco River to Sparrows Point, Md.; House concurs.
- No. 172: Minnesota River, Minnesota: Striking out provision; House concurs.
- Nos. 173, 174, and 175: Continuing survey, Divers Lakes, Minnesota and South Dakota; House concurs.
- No. 176: Tallahatchie River, Mississippi: From Batesville to Coldwater; Senate recedes.
- No. 177: Lock and dam in Yazoo River, near the mouth of the Big Sunflower, Mississippi; Senate recedes.
- No. 178: Cassidy Bayou; Senate recedes.
- No. 179: Horn Island Pass, Mississippi; House concurs.
- No. 180: Hampton River and Harbor, New Hampshire; House concurs.
- No. 181: Colorado River, Nevada: House concurs, with an amendment.
- No. 182: Carleton Bay, New Jersey; House concurs.
- No. 183: Wappinger Creek, New York; Senate recedes.
- No. 184: Fire Island, New York; Senate recedes.
- No. 185: Harlem Kills, New York; House concurs.
- No. 186: Hudson River; Senate recedes, this provision being placed with the general item for Hudson River.
- No. 187: Swanquarter Bay, North Carolina; Provision stricken out and provision for inland waterway inserted in its place.
- No. 188: Bennetts Creek, North Carolina; Senate recedes.

No. 189: Shallotte River, North Carolina; Senate recedes.  
 No. 190: Cape Lookout, Oregon; Senate recedes.  
 No. 191: Yamhill River, Oregon; House concurs.  
 No. 192: Yaquina River, Oregon; Extension of proposed improvement to Elk City; House concurs.  
 No. 193: Willamette River, between Portland and Oregon City, Oreg.; House concurs.  
 No. 194: Willamette River, near Albany, Oreg.; Senate recedes.  
 No. 195: Tillamook Bar, Oregon; Senate recedes.  
 No. 196: Pittsburgh Harbor, Pennsylvania; Senate recedes.  
 No. 197: Georgetown Harbor, South Carolina; House concurs.  
 No. 198: Walls Cut, South Carolina; Senate recedes.  
 No. 199: Hiwassee River, Tennessee; House concurs, with an amendment correcting the spelling.  
 No. 200: Sabine River, Texas; House concurs, with an amendment defining the limits of examination.  
 Nos. 201 and 202: Columbia River, Washington; Senate recedes.  
 No. 203: Snohomish River, Washington; House concurs.  
 No. 204: Puyallup and other waterways, Tacoma, Wash.; House concurs.  
 No. 205: Canal between Puget Sound and Grays Harbor; Senate recedes.  
 No. 206: Harbor at South Milwaukee, Wis.; Change in the phraseology; Senate recedes.  
 No. 207: Miller Bay, Wisconsin; Senate recedes.

## SUMMARY OF AMOUNTS APPROPRIATED AND AUTHORIZED.

Amount appropriated for the next fiscal year in the House bill was.	\$24,014,107
Amounts authorized to be expended after June 30.	38,674,160
Total as passed by the House.	60,688,267
From this amount the Senate made deductions aggregating.	80,700
Balance.	60,607,567
Additions by the Senate amendments aggregate.	9,554,872
Total as passed by the Senate.	70,162,439
Senate additions concurred in.	\$4,500,035
Senate additions nonconcurred in.	5,054,837
Deduct additions nonconcurred in.	5,054,837
Balance total appropriations and authorizations agreed upon.	65,107,602

Divided as follows:  
 Amount appropriated for the next fiscal year. \$26,521,442  
 Amount authorized to be expended after June 30, 1903. 38,586,160  
 65,107,602

T. E. BURTON,  
 WALTER REEVES,  
 RUFUS E. LESTER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

## LEAVE TO PRINT ON SUBSIDIARY COINAGE BILL.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of several members I ask general leave to print on the bill (H. R. 12704) to increase the subsidiary coinage, for five days from to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that members have leave for five days to print remarks upon House bill 12704, to increase the subsidiary coinage. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ALLEGED MILITARY SUPPLY CAMP IN LOUISIANA.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up a privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Resolved, That, if compatible with the interests of the public service, the President be, and he is hereby, requested to send to the House of Representatives full information as to the investigation, by his order, recently made as to the alleged maintenance of a British military supply camp in the State of Louisiana, where military supplies, including horses and mules, are collected and shipped directly to the theater of war in South Africa in violation of the laws of neutrality; and to send to the House of Representatives the report of the officer charged with such investigation, and all documents, letters, and papers on file bearing upon the matter."

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution No. 272, calling upon the President for full information as to the investigation made upon his order as to the alleged military supply camp in the State of Louisiana, having duly considered the same, report it back to the House with the recommendation that it be amended by the adoption of a substitute, as follows, and passed:

"Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to send to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the interests of the public service, full information of the investigation recently made by his order as to the alleged supply camp in the State of Louisiana for the collection and shipment to South Africa of military supplies, including horses and mules."

Mr. HITT. The committee recommends the adoption of the substitute, and it covers the ground of the resolution.

The question was taken, and the substitute was agreed to.

## THANKS TO SECRETARY HAY.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of House concurrent resolution 39, and pass it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves to suspend the rules and pass the following.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House concurrent resolution 39.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the thanks of Congress be presented to Hon. John Hay for the appropriate memorial address delivered by him on the life and services of William McKinley, late President of the United States, in the Representatives' Hall, before both Houses of Congress and their invited guests, on the 27th day of February, 1902, and that he be requested to furnish a copy for publication.

Resolved, That the chairman of the joint committee appointed to make

the necessary arrangements to carry into effect the resolutions of this Congress in relation to the memorial exercises in honor of William McKinley be requested to communicate to Mr. Hay the foregoing resolution, receive his answer thereto, and present the same to both Houses of Congress.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Tennessee, who will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and tellers reported—ayes 92, noes 53.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. How much time is allotted?

The SPEAKER. Twenty minutes on a side?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to yield to the gentleman from Missouri the control of the time for this side.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire only to state that by invitation of the House and of the Senate, by concurrent resolution, Mr. Hay was invited to appear before the joint assembly of the two Houses and deliver a eulogy upon the life and character of William McKinley. The date was fixed and the two Houses assembled, and in the presence of the two Houses, the diplomatic corps, the Supreme Court, the President and his Cabinet Mr. Hay delivered the address. Following that occurrence a resolution, written in the exact language of the resolutions adopted by the House and the Senate on each of the former occasions of the similar death of a President—the death of President Lincoln and the death of President Garfield—thanking Mr. Hay for his effort and asking him for a copy for publication, was introduced, went to the committee, and was reported with the unanimous report of the committee favoring its adoption. Objection having been made to its passage in the House, it comes here now simply for the action of Congress, acting upon a concurrent resolution, thanking Mr. Hay for his address and complimenting him by asking him for a copy of the same. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I recognize very clearly that to oppose the passage of this resolution subjects the man who does it to the adverse criticism of every editor in the United States who is also a postmaster and every editor in the United States who hopes to become a postmaster or to secure a Federal office. I am equally clear that in opposing it I am doing right. I do not intend in what I am about to say to be drawn into making any intemperate remarks. It so happened when the "McKinley committee" met that I was the only member of the committee who suggested any opposition to the vote of thanks to Mr. Secretary Hay for the speech he delivered on the 27th day of February in this House on the life and character of William McKinley; whereupon the papers that I have named jumped on me. Well, now, their jumping on me in no way modifies my conception of public duty and in no degree deters me from discharging it according to my lights. Consequently I am going to express my opinion about it fully, although rather unexpectedly, as I had no idea that the resolution would be called up to-day.

When Mr. Hay rose to deliver his address he had such an audience as only two other men in the entire history of the Government ever had—George Bancroft, when he eulogized Abraham Lincoln, and James G. Blaine, when he pronounced his eulogium upon James A. Garfield—and all of us hope that a similar occasion will never again arise—the death of a President by the hand of an assassin. For the purposes of the orator, Colonel Hay faced the most magnificent audience that can be assembled on this continent—the President and his Cabinet, the Supreme Court of the United States, the Diplomatic Corps, a prince of the German Empire and his suite, both Houses of Congress, the head of the Army, high officers of the Navy, every distinguished man in official and unofficial life betwixt the two oceans that could be crowded into this historic Hall, together with much of the beauty of the land. It was such an audience as any orator would be fortunate to address—such an audience as no orator now living will most probably address.

In many respects I entertain a high opinion and a high regard for the Secretary of State. He is a most amiable and accomplished gentleman. From his youth up he has been associated



with intellectual giants. For four years he was brought into daily contact with Abraham Lincoln, which in itself was a liberal education. Colonel Hay is himself a great historic personage. He has achieved eminence in two difficult fields of human endeavor—in literature and in diplomacy. He has been ambassador to the Court of St. James and is now Secretary of State. In literature he has performed the unusual feat of winning fame in both poetry and prose, such fame as any man in the House or Senate or in the whole country might envy. His *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, or "Abraham Lincoln: A History," as it is entitled, is one of the standard historic works of the world; but in my judgment Mr. Hay's literary reputation will rest more on his Pike County Ballads than upon anything else he has written. Of their class they are about as good as anything else in the English language. As an earnest of what he might have done in poetry, they lead one to regret that their author deserted the muses for the stormy world of politics.

Colonel Hay is a seasoned hand at literature. His address was carefully wrought out in his library. What he said was not uttered in the "heat of debate" or on the spur of the moment. Consequently he can not complain if he is held strictly to the highest standard of good taste.

Not only did he have a distinguished and brilliant audience, but he had an audience entirely sympathetic in its character. I undertake to say, without the fear of successful contradiction, that there was not a man or woman within these walls that day, not a man or woman in his greater audience—the entire American people—who would have objected to any word of eulogy he could have pronounced on William McKinley, however extravagant, for McKinley was a popular favorite—popular with all citizens, all classes, and all parties, in a most extraordinary degree.

The objection I make to thanking the Secretary of State is not that he delivered a eulogy upon Mr. McKinley—that was what he was invited to do, what he was expected to do, what we all, myself included, wanted him to do—but because with that unequalled opportunity, with that magnificent audience, he departed from the language of eulogy and, disregarding the proprieties, injected into his memorial address a high-class Republican stump speech.

King Solomon says: "There is a time for every purpose under heaven." Of course there is a time for Republican speeches. I do not object to Republican speeches at the proper time. Strange as it may seem, I rather enjoy hearing a good Republican stump speech, although I doubt exceedingly if any Republican in these later days can make a stump speech without committing blasphemy. If the gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, for instance, will make a Republican speech, I will hear him gladly. If my distinguished friend from Indiana, Mr. LANDIS, will do it, I will be delighted to hear him. If divers men on that side of the Chamber would rise and make Republican speeches in this House, I would listen with pleasure. I have heard my friend from Pittsburg, the Hon. JOHN DALZELL, make Republican speeches on dry economic subjects in this House which came near being epic poems in their character.

But I will never be willing to thank any man anywhere at any time or in any place for making a Republican speech. [Laughter.] That is what we are asked to do in this resolution. I want to say this to the members of the House, because it ought to be said, that as a literary performance Colonel Hay's address will take high rank. There are some phrases in that oration that are of extraordinary excellence and almost entitle him to the dubious honor of being placed in the same class with Grover Cleveland as a phrase maker. [Laughter.]

I have no objection to the literary character of it, but I am willing to submit it to as good a critic of political speeches as the gentleman from Ohio himself, General GROSVENOR, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCALL, or as the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HITT, or any other man on that side of the Chamber who has literary taste and let him pronounce if Mr. Hay did not violate the proprieties of the occasion when he injected into that eulogy upon President McKinley a Republican stump speech.

He knew himself he was violating the proprieties, because he states—I can not quote the language exactly; I have not time to hunt it up—that he craves the indulgence of those that are hearing him if perchance he injects into the speech remarks that ought not to have been made. Then he proceeded to make a stump speech. For instance, he stated in one place that the very month in which Mr. McKinley was inaugurated steel rails sold for \$18 a ton. I would like very much for some man to state as a literary proposition whether, according to the canons of taste and to preserve the unities of a great historical oration, the fact that steel rails sold at \$18 a ton in the month of March, 1897, had anything to do with the character of William McKinley or with the feeling of kindness and pride which the American people entertain for him.

As a matter of fact, if steel rails sold for \$18 a ton in the month of March, 1897, William McKinley had nothing to do with it, because he had not been in Congress since the 4th day of March, 1891. No Republican had been in office in a high executive place for four years in that month, and if steel rails sold for \$18 a ton at that time, and as it was an unprecedented thing in the history of the country, then the credit ought to have been given where credit is due—to the Democrats of this country—instead of trying to filch it for the Republican party. But, from the sentence that opens up with that declaration until near the close of the address, it was as fine a Republican stump speech as has been delivered on the American continent within the last two years.

I will tell you what will happen, and I know it just as well as that I am living: If you pass this resolution, every Republican candidate for Congress in the United States will not only circulate this speech as the strongest possible Republican campaign document, but at the same time he will circulate the resolution of Congress thanking him for delivering it.

When I objected to the unanimous report of the committee my friend from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] rose and asked me to withdraw it, and I would not do it. I asked for three days to consider the matter whether I would make a minority report, and within the three days I read Mr. Blaine's speech delivered over James A. Garfield as critically and as carefully as any speech was ever read on the American continent.

The difference in situation was that Blaine delivered his speech under the most difficult circumstances that could possibly have surrounded a human being called upon to speak on such an occasion. Here sat the Republican party, divided into two bitter and warring factions. He had to avoid saying too much in praise of Garfield, and he had to avoid insulting what was called the "stalwart" faction of the Republican party. Yet any American citizen could take Blaine's speech and read it from beginning to end without feeling that any impropriety had been committed. It is a magnificent oration. There is not a solitary syllable in it that would offend "feather-head" Republicans, as they were then called, or a "stalwart" Republican, or a Democrat of any of the numberless varieties of that party which there are in this country. [Laughter.] Mr. Blaine observed the proprieties and spoke in perfect good taste.

When Mr. Hay arose to speak, he had no difficulty to confront him. He had simply to observe the rules of good taste—literary taste—to observe the canons of literary criticism. But he did not do it. So far as I am concerned, if there is not another man in this House who votes against thanking him for it, I propose to so vote.

I want to repeat that I am not hide-bound on the subject of politics. I am a Democrat, and always expect to be one. Politics has absolutely nothing to do with my opposition to this resolution of thanks. I recognize that every man has the right to his political opinions and to express them on any occasion that is fitting in terms that seem to him right and proper. As a matter of fact, less than two months ago I sat in my place here and led the applause for my distinguished friend from the State of Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] when he was delivering a brilliant Republican speech [laughter]; and I performed the very same kindly office for my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH] when he delivered his great oration on the Cuban reciprocity scheme. But I believe, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, that the House simply sinks its own dignity when it votes to thank a man for delivering a political speech (I care not how classical its phrases), when he ought to have observed all of the proprieties of the occasion which he not only failed to observe, but which he violated in the most flagrant manner. [Applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has seven minutes and the gentlemen from Ohio seventeen minutes.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER].

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I came into this Hall a few moments ago when we were voting on seconding the motion to suspend the rules on this proposition. Sir, I had the honor to be appointed by the Speaker as a committeeman from the State of Mississippi on the joint memorial committee of both Houses of Congress to present suitable resolutions in honor of our deceased President, Mr. McKinley, and to select an appropriate speaker to deliver the eulogy on that occasion. I accepted the position, and united in the selection of the present Secretary of State to deliver the eulogy.

I came into this Hall on the day when the Senate, with the Supreme Court and the foreign ambassadors assembled with us here, and I listened with great care and attention to the address delivered by Mr. Hay.

I think I am as good a Democrat as my friend from Missouri; I think I am as keenly alive to everything that affects the interests and the honor and the welfare of the Democratic party as my friend from Missouri, whom I so much admire, but from whom I entirely dissent on this occasion. I listened to that address with great care, with great caution, and even with a disposition to criticize if anything wrong had been said. But I failed to detect in the whole of that address anything that I thought was improper to be said or anything said in a party spirit.

And I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that if a man selected for the great duty of speaking upon that occasion the sentiments of the American people had dared to inject into his address anything that was an appeal to party spirit and party sentiment the shade of our great President breaking the ceremonies of the tomb would have appeared before him and at once challenged his utterances. Any man who would have made here on such an occasion a speech political in its character would in doing so have dishonored the memory of McKinley's great absence of partisan feeling and partisan ideas.

President McKinley was a Republican; the man selected as orator by the joint committee was a Republican. Did we expect to select any other? I was charmed with his address. I listened to it with great pleasure, and I am sure that the great personage he was talking about would not have countenanced for a moment any exhibition of partisan spirit or partisan heat. It never entered my own mind that he had such an idea. I know Mr. Hay slightly and have had several interviews with him, none since he delivered that speech, however; but I am frank to say that I listened to that speech with great pleasure, and believed that it was worthy of the great man about whom he talked. McKinley was a Republican, an honest man, an upright man, a man whose great heart and whose loyal nature took in all the people of his country. When he came to be President he had the admiration and support of all the people of his country, not of one party, but of both.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget the last time I saw that great spirit in the flesh. I was passing through the city of Washington on my way to New York. I called to pay my respects to the President of the United States. We had served thirteen or fourteen years in this Hall together. I sat on this side, he sat on that. Our intimacy had been great, and when I called to see him he kindly introduced me to some Ohio friends who were in the room and said, "Take a seat, I want to talk with you about our long service together in Congress."

He seated me while these gentlemen were still there, and when I was about to go he said to me, speaking to me with the kindness of nature that always characterized him: "Mr. HOOKER, is there anything I can do for you?" I said: "No, Mr. President, I have simply come to pay my respects to you, as I chanced to be passing through the Federal city." "Well," said he, seizing my one hand with both of his, "if you have a young man in your region of country who acquitted himself with credit in the Spanish-American war, I would be glad to give you a lieutenantcy for him." I said: "Why, Mr. President, I had not thought of such an honor. It is very generous on your part." But it was just like McKinley.

I saw it in the same kindly feeling that had existed between him and myself for twelve or thirteen or fourteen years. I said to him, "I can not now think of any young man specially worthy of the high honor which you propose to confer, but I will communicate with my friends in Mississippi; I will communicate with my friend Governor Lowry and with my son;" and they suggested the name of Richard P. Winslow, whose father and grandfather I had known.

I knew by the character of the family, although I did not know the boy intimately, that he must be worthy of the honor. I wrote to Mr. McKinley at his home in Canton, before he made the fatal visit to Buffalo, and when I returned from the mountains of Virginia, where I passed the summer, I said to myself, "I will go to the War Office and see what came of the offer that McKinley so generously made;" and when I went up there, Colonel McCain, of the United States Army, from my own State, in the Adjutant-General's Office, said, "I will look over the books and see whether any such name is there." And when he had examined he found the name of Richard P. Winslow, and on the margin a big hand was drawn with the index finger pointing to the name of Richard P. Winslow, and opposite that name was this memorandum in red ink: "The President requests that this nomination be made special." I am glad to say that young man stood his examination a few days ago and his name has been favorably reported and is now on the Senate Calendar for confirmation.

He never forgot me. He was not the kind of a man who forgot. And I say that the man selected to deliver the address in commemoration of him and to utter the sentiments which all the people of this country entertained for him, and proudly entertained, would not have dared to undertake to deliver a political

address when he was speaking of a man of such high character, such noble nature, such pure life, as our assassinated President. [Applause.]

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time of Mr. HOOKER having expired, Mr. CLARK yielded to him five minutes of his time.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will consume the remainder of his time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I care to use even two minutes. I simply desire to say that I listened with a great deal of interest to the address of Secretary Hay on the life and character of Mr. McKinley. I thought at the time that there were some things in that address of a partisan character not entirely appropriate to a funeral occasion. But there was much in the address to be admired, especially his eloquent tribute to the high personal character of the late President, and I fear a vote against this resolution would not be considered as a mere criticism against the partisan portion of the address, but might have a tendency to detract from that profound tribute of respect which the American people unite in paying to the memory of our martyred President, and I shall, therefore, support the resolution.

Mr. CLARK. I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has one minute remaining.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman will observe the ordinary courtesies of debate, and close on his side now, and let me have the closing speech.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I will yield a minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not want that minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition either to fence with the gentleman from Missouri or to say anything on an occasion like this that will in any way irritate or annoy any gentleman who sees fit to vote upon this question one way or the other.

I hope the House will insist upon this action, however. Had this committee not brought this resolution here there would have been world-wide criticism of the committee for having failed to do that which is customary under circumstances such as we were surrounded by. It would have been said in every newspaper of the country that, having invoked the address and assembled a great audience to hear it, we had ourselves condemned the occasion by refusing to go through with the ordinary duty of complimenting the gentleman who delivered the address. Therefore the committee took up the question, considered the resolution, and brought its report to this House; and now it is a question for this House to say, not whether it shall indorse whatever of politics may have worked its way incidentally into that address, but whether upon the whole this distinguished man, having been invited to make this address, should now be condemned, or as the gentleman from Illinois has very well suggested, whether the memory of McKinley shall be condemned in the House of Representatives of his country.

I took a great deal of pains, following the criticism that was made in the committee by the gentleman from Missouri, to scan through two or three different clipping bureaus utterances of the Democratic press of this country upon the occasion and upon the address of Mr. Hay. Almost without exception there was a universal acclaim of praise of Mr. Hay, not only because of the literary character of his production, but of the temper and spirit which he had manifested. Now let me quote the argument made in one of the leading Democratic newspapers of the country in opposition to the suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri. It was this. The editorial said:

It may be said that some of the language of Mr. Hay approaches very closely upon the line of political argument. But—

Said the editor of that paper—

how can you eliminate William McKinley from his life work?

William McKinley was a partisan Republican, and he was admired by the masses of the Democrats of this country because of his manly partisanship. And now that he is dead and his eulogist speaks of the results of his life work gentlemen complain. The gentleman from Missouri says that he mentioned the fact that steel rails were sold at \$18 a ton on some occasion, and the gentleman from Missouri, with some lack of his usual acumen in a case of this kind, has failed to develop what it is that grew out of that suggestion that he complained of. But I will not discuss it. You can not eulogize a dead politician, a dead statesman, a great man dead without referring to what he has done. I have sat upon this floor and have heard eulogies of Randall and a large number of leading honorable and distinguished Democrats, and I have heard repeatedly, over and over again, the proud boasts of



their eulogists of their achievements in behalf of the Democratic party, and yet we have always printed those eulogies. If there was anything useful for stump orators in referring to the character of such men as Randall and other men to whom I might refer, it was that they had become valuable as illustrators of the policy of the party to which they belonged.

Mr. Speaker, you can not speak of McKinley without you curtail your own independence, if you say nothing about his attitude upon these great political questions. I undertake to say that no mere eulogistic address is freer from it than this. Freer than any eulogy that ever was presented in this House upon the character of distinguished men, such as Hendricks, of Indiana, and a dozen others whom I might name. Why are we afraid to have go to the world the suggestion made by an intimate friend and Cabinet officer of McKinley, that he had accomplished something as a partisan. Why, Mr. Speaker, it would go forth to all the world that the Democratic party of this House, after all their high eulogiums of McKinley, after all their sincere and honest regrets for his death, after all that they have said and done in this House, yet when the last moment came when they could strike one blow at his fame and mar his standing before the world that they had availed themselves of that which was practically a funeral occasion to condemn the words of eulogy made on that occasion. I can not believe that the partisanship of this country has led men to such a position as that, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no vote on this floor against this resolution.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution; and upon that question the gentleman asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 46, answering "present" 25, not voting 151; as follows:

## YEAS—130.

Alexander,	Fitzgerald,	Latimer,	Reeder,
Allen, Me.	Fletcher,	Lawrence,	Reeves,
Barney,	Foster, Vt.	Lessler,	Rhea, Va.
Bartholdt,	Gaines, W. Va.	Littauer,	Rumple,
Bates,	Gardner, Mich.	Littlefield,	Sherman,
Bellamy,	Gibson,	Loving,	Showalter,
Bishop,	Gill,	McAndrews,	Sibley,
Blackburn,	Gleason,	McCall,	Smith, Ill.
Bowersock,	Grosvenor,	McCleary,	Smith, Iowa
Breazeale,	Grow,	Mann,	Sperry,
Brick,	Hamilton,	Mercer,	Steele,
Bromwell,	Hanbury,	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. J.
Brown,	Haskins,	Mickey,	Storm,
Burleigh,	Hedge,	Minor,	Sulloway,
Burton,	Hemenway,	Mondell,	Sutherland,
Caldwell,	Henry, Conn.	Moody, N. C.	Tawney,
Cannon,	Hepburn,	Moody, Oreg.	Thayer,
Capron,	Hill,	Morris,	Thomas, Iowa
Cassingham,	Hitt,	Moss,	Tirrell,
Connell,	Hooker,	Mudd,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Conner,	Howard,	Needham,	Tompkins, Ohio
Coombs,	Howell,	Nevin,	Tongue,
Cousins,	Hull,	Olsted,	Van Voorhis,
Cramer,	Irwin,	Otjen,	Vreeland,
Crumpacker,	Jenkins,	Parker,	Wachter,
Cushman,	Jett,	Patterson, Pa.	Wadsworth,
Dalzell,	Jones, Wash.	Patterson, Tenn.	Wanger,
Davidson,	Kehoe,	Payne,	Warnock,
Deemer,	Kitchin, Claude	Perkins,	Watson,
Dovener,	Knapp,	Powers, Mass.	Williams, Ill.
Eddy,	Lacey,	Prince,	The Speaker.
Esch,	Landis,	Ransdell, La.	
Evans,	Lanham,	Ray, N. Y.	

## NAYS—46.

Adamson,	Cochran,	Lever,	Slayden,
Ball, Tex.	Conry,	Lewis, Ga.	Smith, Ky.
Bartlett,	De Armond,	Little,	Sparkman,
Bowie,	Feely,	Lloyd,	Spight,
Brantley,	Green, Pa.	McCulloch,	Stark,
Brundidge,	Henry, Miss.	McLain,	Sulzer,
Burgess,	Johnson,	Maddox,	Underwood,
Burleson,	Jones, Va.	Mahoney,	Wheeler,
Burnett,	Kern,	Neville,	Williams, Miss.
Candler,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Richardson, Tenn.	Wooten.
Clark,	Kieberg,	Scarborough,	
Clayton,	Lester,	Sims,	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—25.

Bell,	Gilbert,	Norton,	Small,
Brownlow,	Hay,	Reid,	Smith, H. C.
Cooper, Tex.	Ketcham,	Richardson, Ala.	Stephens, Tex.
Cowherd,	Lamb,	Rixey,	Thompson.
Crowley,	Livingston,	Robinson, Nebr.	
Finley,	McClellan,	Rucker,	
Gaines, Tenn.	Naphe,	Shallenberger,	

## NOT VOTING—151.

Acheson,	Bingham,	Butler, Mo.	Dahle,
Adams,	Blakeney,	Butler, Pa.	Darragh,
Allen, Ky.	Boreing,	Calderhead,	Davey, La.
Applin,	Bottell,	Cassel,	Davis, Fla.
Babcock,	Bristow,	Cooney,	Dayton,
Ball, Del.	Broussard,	Cooper, Wis.	De Graffenreid,
Bankhead,	Bull,	Corliss,	Dick,
Beidler,	Burk, Pa.	Creamer,	Dinsmore,
Belmont,	Burke, S. Dak.	Currier,	Dougherty,
Benton,	Burkett,	Curtis,	Douglas,

Draper,	Hildebrandt,	Moon,	Sheppard,
Driscoll,	Holliday,	Morgan,	Skiles,
Edwards,	Hopkins,	Morrell,	Smith, S. W.
Elliott,	Hughes,	Mutchler,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Emerson,	Jack,	Newlands,	Snodgrass,
Fleming,	Jackson, Kans.	Overstreet,	Snook,
Flood,	Jackson, Md.	Padgett,	Southard,
Foerderer,	Joy,	Palmer,	Southwick,
Fordney,	Kahn,	Pearre,	Stevens, Minn.
Foss,	Klutz,	Pierce,	Stewart, N. Y.
Foster, Ill.	Knox,	Pou,	Swanson,
Fowler,	Kyle,	Powers, Me.	Talbert,
Fox,	Lassiter,	Pugsley,	Tate,
Gardner, N. J.	Lewis, Pa.	Randell, Tex.	Taylor, Ohio
Gillet, N. Y.	Lindsay,	Robb,	Taylor, Ala.
Gillet, Mass.	Long,	Roberts,	Thomas, N. C.
Goldfogle,	Loud,	Robertson, La.	Trimble,
Gooch,	Loudenslager,	Robinson, Ind.	Vandiver,
Gordon,	McDermott,	Ruppert,	Warner,
Graft,	McLachlan,	Russell,	Weeks,
Graham,	McRae,	Ryan,	White,
Greene, Mass.	Mahon,	Schirm,	Wiley,
Griffith,	Marshall,	Scott,	Wilson,
Griggs,	Martin,	Selby,	Woods,
Hall,	Maynard,	Shackleford,	Wright,
Haugen,	Meyer, La.	Shafroth,	Young,
Heatwole,	Miers, Ind.	Shattuc,	Zenor.
Henry, Tex.	Miller,	Shelden,	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the resolution was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. BULL with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. BELMONT.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. McCLELLAN.

Until further notice:

Mr. SHATTUC with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. SELBY.

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. KLUTTZ.

Mr. JACK with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Mr. LONG with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. McLACHLAN with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.

Mr. BURKETT with Mr. SHALLENBERGER.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. NAPHEN.

Mr. CURTIS with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. CREAMER.

Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.

Mr. REEDER with Mr. WHITE.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. FOX.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. MOON.

Mr. GORDON with Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. MIERS of Indiana.

Mr. SKILES with Mr. TALBERT.

For this day:

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. HUGHES with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. SHELLEN with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. WARNER with Mr. REID.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. LASSITER.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. WILSON.

Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. KYLE with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. PADGETT.

Mr. GRAFF with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.

Mr. FOERDERER with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. CORLISS with Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. DINSMORE.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota with Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. SNOOK.

Mr. MARSHALL with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

Mr. DICK with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. ROBB.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky.

Mr. BALL of Delaware with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. JOY with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. ZENOR.

On this vote:

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. McRAE.

Mr. SCHIRM with Mr. SHAFROTH.

Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. MUTCHLER.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. BRISTOW with Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. RYAN.

Mr. GILLET of New York with Mr. GRIFFITH.

For ten days:

Mr. MILLER with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont with Mr. POU.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana.

For one week:

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. BELLAMY.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. DARRAGH with Mr. THOMPSON until June 9.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I voted in the negative, but I find I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHATTUC, and I withdraw my vote and wish to be marked "present."

The Clerk called Mr. RUCKER's name, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

Mr. BROWNLOW. Mr. Speaker, has my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. PIERCE] voted?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. BROWNLOW. Then I desire to withdraw my vote, which was cast in the affirmative, and be recorded as "present."

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I have voted on this proposition in the affirmative. I notice, however, that I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. TAYLOR]. I therefore desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded "present."

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I notice that I was announced as paired with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER]; but as that gentleman is present I have voted.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to have the pair withdrawn?

Mr. STEELE. I do.

The SPEAKER. The pair will be withdrawn.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2764. An act for the relief of the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company; and

S. R. 100. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for an equestrian statue of the late Maj. Gen. William J. Sewell, United States Volunteers.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9290) granting a pension to Frances L. Ackley.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 11249) granting an increase of pension to Katharine Rains Paul, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 19) for the relief of George A. Orr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 567) for the relief of H. B. Mattoon.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1920) for the relief of Albert C. Brown.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. R. 22) providing for the publication of 50,000 copies of the Special Report on the

Diseases of the Horse, be authorized to correct the title thereof by striking out the words "fifty thousand" and inserting the words "two hundred thousand;" so as to make the same correspond with the amendment of the House of Representatives to the said resolution concurred in by the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 91. Joint resolution providing for the publication of 50,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle; and

S. 92. Joint resolution providing for the publication of 50,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse.

#### PROTECTION OF GAME IN ALASKA.

Mr. CUSHMAN. I call up for present action the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11535) for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes. The report and the statement of the House conferees have already been printed in the RECORD. I ask that the statement be read, omitting the report.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the reading of the report will be dispensed with.

The statement of the House conferees, as published in the proceedings of May 29, was read.

The question being taken, the conference report was agreed to.

#### FIRST LIEUT. JOSEPH M. SIMMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3360) for the promotion of Lieut. Joseph M. Simms, Revenue-Cutter Service, the bill having been returned from the Senate with the information that the amendment of the House was disagreed to and a conference requested.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. HEPBURN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. ADAMSON as conferees on the part of the House.

#### RETIREMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

Mr. HULL. I move to suspend the rules so as to take up and pass the bill (S. 5213) providing for the selection and retirement of medical officers in the Army.

The bill was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to select one from such medical officers of the Army as have served forty-one years or more, nine years of which shall have been as Surgeon-General, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint him a major-general of the United States Army, for the purpose of placing him on the retired list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I demand a second on the motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. HULL. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not object to that; but I think this question ought to be debated.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection the motion to suspend the rules will be considered as seconded.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is entitled to the floor for twenty minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House more than a minute or two. This bill is designed to retire the Surgeon-General of the Army only one grade higher than the rank which he now holds, and to place him on an equality with the Surgeon-General of the Navy, who has recently been retired. The bill has received a unanimous report in its favor from the Committee on Military Affairs, gentlemen of both parties on that committee concurring. If the bill should pass it will make the present Surgeon-General of the Army a major-general on his retirement, the 8th day of this month. The bill has already passed the Senate. There is nothing else involved in it than this one proposition. I think that in justice to this distinguished man, who has served over forty years and has advanced the cause of science more, probably, than any other one professional man in the United States, he should receive on his retirement this recognition at the hands of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for two minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will pass this bill. The medical fraternity of my State, in convention assembled, has recommended its passage. So have similar conventions in several other States of the South. During the prevalence of yellow fever in the State of Alabama this man was the only officer who dared go there and remain through the entire prevalence of the epidemic. He remained there while five other physicians died. In rendering this service he took his life in his hands. He is a most worthy man. As has just been stated by the chairman of the Military Committee [Mr. HULL], the passage of this



bill would simply put this officer upon an equality with others who have received this promotion. I hope that gentlemen on both sides of the House will unite in passing the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HULL. For how long?

Mr. CANNON. For two minutes.

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have some acquaintance with the Surgeon-General of the Army. I have always found him a pleasant gentleman. So far as I know or believe he has performed his duties well. He is shortly to retire, I understand, on three-fourths of the regular pay. His present rank is that of brigadier-general. This bill, as I understand, proposes to retire him with the rank of major-general. Now, I must say—I hope it may not seem ungracious for me to make the remark I am about to make; I hope it may not look as if I were speaking unkindly of this particular individual, for I speak without any malice—but I must say for one that I am tired of pursuing the policy of promoting an officer to a rank that he never held and then retiring him. [Applause.]

To me it seems a mere gratuity, and while we inveigh here against civil pension lists, I will not discuss that subject. We understand what our system does for us and the abuses that exist in it. We must in the future have a large Regular Army compared with what we have had heretofore. The chances are that it will be larger instead of smaller. We start out to have as good a Navy as any nation in the world. The evolution and growth of our Navy and Army are necessary to our civilization. If these things are to be done, they ought to be done along the line of general policy. Now, I think I have said all I want to about this matter, and for one, having nothing against General Sternberg and everything, so far as I know, in his favor, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized to control the time in the negative.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I concur with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has said in reference to General Sternberg. He is an excellent gentleman, an able officer, a kindly man; but when are we going to stop using the money of the Government of the United States for gratuities to reward those men whom we personally like? Now, there are other bills before this committee of the same kind as this.

Mr. ADAMSON. Is the report on this bill unanimous?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. From what committee does it come?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. From the Military Committee. I have not looked at the report or read it, but I know the facts. I will correct myself and say that I did read the report some days ago; but there is a bill before this committee for the promotion and retirement of Colonel Greenleaf. There is a bill before this committee for the promotion and retirement of General Smith. Neither of these bills has been reported. They have been hanging around here for years. Both are in the same Department, both excellent men, both men entitled to credit; but I agree that those bills ought not to be reported. Colonel Greenleaf and General Smith have had no members to curry favor with, because they have not been at the head of a great department; neither have they had the opportunity to go around and get up resolutions from State medical associations to come here and ask Congress to promote them. Now, that is all there is in this bill. My friend from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] stated the fact absolutely when he said he was going to vote for this bill, not because this man was going to promote the service of the United States, not because he is entitled to \$2,000 a year more for the balance of his life, but because the State Medical Board of Georgia has asked that he be promoted.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If our constituents send us here to have State societies direct us how to cast our votes, we had better go home and let them send men here who can do their thinking for themselves.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman permit me to correct him?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is badly mistaken when he says that I predicated my vote on the action of the board.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood that to be what the gentleman said.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No, sir; I gave that simply as an evidence that he was worthy. I want to ask the gentleman one question now. If the gentleman has not read the report of that committee, which he says he has not read, upon what does he predicate his opposition to the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I corrected that statement.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say that is a unanimous report, Democrats and Republicans both signing it. Now, you say you have not read it. Upon what do you predicate your opposition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. As I stated to your colleague from Georgia, I first said that I had not read the report, but I remembered that I had, and it is not on that report that I base my opposition. I know there is not a man who has ever occupied the position that General Sternberg has during the entire history of this Government who has ever been retired at a higher rank than brigadier-general. The men who occupied that high position during the civil war, with all the great responsibilities and duties that rested on them, were only retired as brigadier-generals; and now because this officer, an efficient officer, I grant you, has seen fit to go through the country and secure the indorsement of State medical boards in the various States to come here and lobby with us for his promotion, to pay him \$2,000 a year more than his rank entitles him to and more than the law entitles him to, and more than anything else on earth entitles him to except that he wants as a gratuity to be paid \$2,000 more a year retirement pay, without rendering any service to the Government of the United States, that is no reason why we should vote to do it.

I say if that hour and day has come when, because a man is a good fellow, because he has friends throughout the United States, because he is able from the various districts to petition that he may run his hand into the Treasury of the United States and appropriate to himself the money that is put there for the benefit of the people—if that hour has come, then I say this man is entitled to it. But if we are to stand here to do justice and to pay a man what he is entitled to and no more, there is no reason on earth why General Sternberg should be promoted above every other man that has ever occupied his position and be retired as a major-general rather than as a brigadier-general, and for that reason I oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, like others that preceded it, raises a question which deserves consideration. Do existing laws make fair, reasonable, and ample provision for the retirement of superannuated military officers? If not, the general laws should be revised. If the pay of retired officers authorized by the statutes is insufficient, then a higher rate of pay should be allowed. I have observed that officers who reach the age of retirement find somewhere in the House or in the Senate, or both, a sufficient number of personal friends to secure the introduction and favorable report of bills recommending retirement, with a rank higher than that enjoyed during the time of service, with the pay of the higher rank; and so the matter invariably comes before us in such a way as to make the discussion personal instead of general.

When a bill of this kind comes up, to oppose it has the complexion of hostility to the beneficiary of the bill. This places members of the House in the attitude of personal hostility to the retiring officer, when, in fact, they only feel a repugnance to a proceeding that has become so frequent that the general laws governing the question are rendered nugatory. It is a new departure, this habit of giving to Army officers upon retirement for the remainder of their lives vastly larger pay than is provided by the general law. The sooner the House refuses to pass bills of this kind the better.

It is pertinent to inquire is this connection whether the statutes now in force do not generously provide for superannuated military officers. If one could enter civil employment with the understanding that during good behavior he would receive fair compensation for his services and at the end of a certain period of service be retired with three-quarters or four-fifths pay during the remainder of his life, we would look upon such a person as extremely fortunate. I believe the pay of our retired officers is large enough. I believe that to constantly increase the allowances is sheer extravagance. Presumably when an officer retires from active service, it is at a time of life when his necessities are no greater and presumably much less than during his earlier years. If he has a family, his sons and daughters have been educated. The expense of living of people of advanced years is certainly no greater than that of people in the meridian of life.

Very early in the history of the Government we concluded to provide in their declining years for our military officers. The laws on the statute books do this. I know of no case recently where a distinguished military officer has been retired without advancing his rank. We deal with them one by one and pass special laws as one after another is retired. If the pay provided for retiring officers is too small, the general law should be changed. If it is large enough, legislation originating in the circle of personal friends and promoted as a mere expression of good fellowship is wrong.

This rests upon the fact that he has been conspicuous in the

military service of the country for forty-one years. Has he been well paid during that time; did he seek the employment, and was he satisfied with it? There is no complaint that his emolument as an official was insufficient. The mere fact that retirement at three-fourth's pay is guaranteed to our officers makes it unnecessary for them during their service to make provision for old age which people in private employment are compelled to do. I see no reason on earth why bills like this should be brought in one after another. Every man gives some reason why a general law should be revised, and it should not be a personal matter, and then we could pass upon the general merits of the subject.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has nine minutes remaining.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the protest of the gentleman from Illinois is very timely. It occurs to me that there is no principle of justice which demands the passage of this measure. Certainly no appeal to the charitable feeling we have justifies its passage. It is sought to have Congress pass this measure upon the alleged ground of the long and distinguished services of the Surgeon-General. Mr. Speaker, the fact is, the proposition, stripped of all excuses, is simply a proposition to give General Sternberg larger pay than he has earned under the law under the general existing statute. The purpose is that he may be the recipient of a gratuity, a bounty from Congress.

Now, it is not right for the members of this House to take public money and devote it to such a purpose as that. The Surgeon-General, in his present rank as brigadier-general, will get three-fourths of the \$5,500 that he draws as a brigadier-general; and under this measure, if this bill should become law, he would draw three-fourths of \$7,500. He would get about \$1,500 more than he is entitled to under the existing law. May I ask what right have we to take the public money, coming from the people by way of taxation, to give to some official who has been pleasant in his dealings with us, and who has rendered valuable service to his country? There is no officer to-day in public service, I dare to say, that could not make a strong case why he should be retired with increased pay.

Every man thinks he is entitled to more pay. Nearly every man on the floor of this House thinks he is entitled to more pay as a Congressman. Nearly every man here thinks that if the Government should go into this business, if it go into bounties for people who have served their country, there is, at least, the same reason for giving pay to men who have served here a long time as there is to a man like this one, who has drawn public pay for forty years. There must be an end to this evil. For one, I can not vote for this bill. Every time you pass a special bill of this sort you create a precedent that is going to give us trouble; and, while I do not worship precedents, I do not think we ought to pass any bill that may create a bad precedent hereafter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], that we should stop this kind of legislation. What does this bill propose? First, to promote an officer to a higher rank; second, then retire him; third, with an increased salary. Promote an officer, increase his salary, to do what? Nothing. This is a drastic and endless-chain policy that is in derogation of the public welfare. Throughout my career in Congress I have steadfastly opposed such laws.

But I have another reason which I might assign for retiring the distinguished gentleman for whose benefit this bill is proposed—General Sternberg. In his last official report, at page 127, General Sternberg says: "The health of the Army must be regarded as having been unusually good during the calendar year of 1900, the medical certificates of which are tabulated in the present report." Let us see, then, what the "present report" shows. This, mind you, is the professional and official opinion of General Sternberg. Bear in mind that he is speaking of "the health of the Army" encamped within the limits of the United States and elsewhere, and that he says the health of our Army "has been unusually good during the calendar year of 1900," as shown by the present report.

His report shows that before the Spanish war, in the year 1897, the death rate amongst our troops "serving in the United States" was "3.14 per 1,000 of men from 'disease' only;" that amongst our troops "serving in the United States" the death rate from "disease" only, in 1899, was 6.56 out of every thousand of men, and 4.83 in 1900 per 1,000 of men "serving in the United States." Even this showing demonstrates that the death rate was higher in the United States—that is, "amongst troops serving in the United States"—in 1900 than in 1897. But the troops "serving

in the United States" was not the whole "Army," and as his report speaks of "the health of the Army," we will see now what his report shows the death rate from "disease" was amongst our troops serving outside of the United States—in our colonies.

This same report shows that a death rate of our troops serving in the Philippine Islands per 1,000 of men was, in 1899, 15.30, and in 1900, 20.26; that is, 5 more men died from disease in the Philippine Islands out of every thousand than in 1899, and about 17 more in 1900 than in 1897, before the Spanish war, when our troops were "serving within (the limits of) the United States."

This report further shows that our troops while serving in China died at the rate of 23.62 from "disease" out of every thousand of soldiers, or 20 more than when serving in the United States in 1897. These troops in China—the most of them—came from the Philippines, others from Cuba; and although China is a cold climate, they were so broken in health and poisoned with tropical disease that the death rate was greater in actual warfare than in 1900 or 1899, when in the Philippine Islands in actual warfare.

Yet this distinguished surgeon now asks Congress to promote and retire him, and on an increased salary, because of his great public service, his friends say, in the face of this professional and official opinion of his, incorporated in his official report and sent to Congress and given to the American people, to inform them that "the health of the Army" of the United States "must be regarded as having been unusually good during the calendar year 1900."

He would have Congress and the American people to read his opinion, and the young men who want to join the Army, at the same time setting forth certified information in his report that fairly overthrows and repudiates his opinion, and shows that it is unfounded and altogether misleading, however little he may have intended to mislead.

Now, when an officer of this Government will allow such official language as this, which I have quoted, to go before Congress and the American people to create, as it has created, the impression that "the health of our Army" is improving—"unusually good during the calendar year 1900"—I for one am ready to retire such a public officer, but without promotion and without an increase in his salary. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HULL. How much time has the gentleman from Alabama remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has four minutes remaining.

Mr. HULL. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has fifteen minutes.

Mr. HULL. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I admire as much as anybody can the stern economy of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the patriotism of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], who seem to think that if any bill is brought in here for the purpose of granting some reward to some man who has distinguished himself the members of the committee who report the bill, and the gentlemen of the House who vote for it, ought to be scolded. Now, the gentleman from Alabama says that men who come here and vote for bills of this sort, because medical societies ask them to do it, ought to stay at home and let somebody come here who has a mind of his own. I venture to say the gentleman from Alabama frequently votes for measures that come before the House in accordance with what he believes to be the views of his constituents.

Now, if there is any profession in this country that is qualified to say who of its members should be honored it is the medical profession. I am willing to take the views of the medical societies of this country upon a question as to whether or not a great surgeon and a great physician, a man who has rendered great services to his country and to science, is such a man as should be distinguished and honored by the American Congress. Such a man is General Sternberg.

Gentlemen talk about his having pay, and that, stripped of everything else, the only object of this measure is to give him additional pay. That is not correct. The reason why I support the measure is that, being familiar with the record of General Sternberg, knowing the services he has rendered, knowing that he has rendered distinguished services to his country, I believe that he is a fit subject for this Congress to bestow a high honor and a distinction upon.

Gentlemen say we ought to stop this kind of legislation—that it has gone far enough. I challenge any gentleman on this floor to point me to a bill of a similar character which has passed this Congress during the last six years, or even before that time. I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Missouri to tell



me when a bill has passed which is of a character like this. This is a bill which stands by itself. There has been no bill of the kind passed that I know of, except, perhaps, in the case of General Corbin, and even that was not on all fours with this bill.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is one reason why I am opposing this bill. I do not want to create a new precedent.

Mr. HAY. No; the gentleman said he opposed this bill because he wanted to stop this kind of legislation.

Mr. CLAYTON. And because I did not want to make any new precedent.

Mr. HAY. If it has not begun, how can it be stopped? What objection has the gentleman to bestowing an honor upon a gentleman who has rendered such distinguished service?

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not want to create a new precedent.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman does not want to do something that ought to be done.

Mr. CLAYTON. I do not agree with the gentleman that it ought to be done. I do not think we ought to spend the people's money in this way.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman is very chary of the people's money, and yet a great many bills go through this House spending the people's money and the gentleman makes no objection to them.

Mr. CLAYTON. I vote against them every time.

Mr. HAY. Oh, you vote against them every time.

Mr. HANBURY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. HANBURY. Is this the only meritorious case in the Army or in the Navy?

Mr. HAY. It is the only case now before Congress for action, and I don't know of any other case like it on the Calendar.

Mr. HANBURY. If we grant this one, will you guarantee that you will stop here?

Mr. HAY. I can not guarantee what Congress will do. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Military Affairs has voted down a general bill of this character.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. No Surgeon-General has ever been made a major-general.

Mr. HAY. No Surgeon-General of the Army, but General Van Reypen of the Navy has been retired on a rank similar to that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HULL. I yield the gentleman from Virginia two minutes more.

Mr. CLARK. If this bill is passed, does not it follow that every retiring Surgeon-General hereafter will come in and apply to be retired as a major-general?

Mr. HAY. Not at all; it does not follow by any means.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Was this General Sternberg the surgeon who had charge of Camp George H. Thomas, at Chickamauga, during the war with Spain?

Mr. HAY. Not at all.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I understood that he was.

Mr. HAY. This officer is the Surgeon-General of the Army, and did not have charge of any particular camp.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. But he had charge of the man who did have charge of that camp.

Mr. HAY. He had general supervision of that camp and of others, but he had no immediate charge of it.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. It seems to me he had his headquarters down there.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. He ought to know that the Surgeon-General of the Army is stationed here at the War Department and has his headquarters here.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. We heard a good deal about him down there.

Mr. HAY. You are thinking of your friend from Pennsylvania, General Huidekoper. [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. As I understand, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] states that his committee has refused to report a general bill of this kind.

Mr. HAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why?

Mr. HAY. Because we did not think that such legislation would be wise or proper. This is a bill that stands by itself—stands on its own merits—stands on the merits of the man concerned.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Could not the other bill stand on its merits?

Mr. HAY. It had to do that; but we did not think it had sufficient merit to justify us in reporting it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then you think this is an isolated case?

Mr. HAY. I think so. I think that this gentleman has rendered such service as to make it so.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has any other bill of this kind been reported from your committee?

Mr. HAY. Not that I know of.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is there not one for Haywood?

Mr. HAY. That is a bill which, if reported at all, must have come from the Committee on Naval Affairs, not from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] has expired.

Mr. HULL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Adamson.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] was on the floor I asked him a question with the purpose of ascertaining the situation of this matter before the Committee on Military Affairs and why no member of that committee on this side took charge of this debate rather than gentlemen who are not members of that committee. The gentleman from Alabama being unable to answer my question, I procured a copy of the report, and I find that it is unanimous.

Now, this House does its business mainly, almost entirely, through committees. I find that in the Committee on Military Affairs each side of the House is represented by able gentlemen. When that is the case, members of the committee on both sides joining in a report, I generally accept that report, unless some unusual and overpowering reason appears for adopting the contrary course. If the question involved is a partisan question, and if any member of the committee dissents, it is generally safe to go with the man who is farthest away from the Republicans, for he is generally, according to my notion, found to be nearer right.

But on this question, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, there is not any politics; and on questions connected with the Army and Navy of the United States there ought never to be any politics. A distinguished admiral of our Navy was laughed at a few years ago when he said he did not know whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. But, sir, in Army and Navy matters—in appointments and promotions of officers of the Army or the Navy—there ought not to be any indication of any knowledge of the politics of the persons concerned or any political motives moving to action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there is a unanimous report of the members of this committee, and as no gentleman on the committee rises to oppose this bill, and inasmuch as a perusal of the report shows that the members of that committee were not derelict in duty in the investigation of this bill, but took all measures for reaching a correct conclusion, and did, in my judgment, reach a correct conclusion. I intend to vote for the bill.

Mr. HULL. I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to occupy now the remainder of his time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has four minutes remaining.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that General Sternberg receives as a brigadier-general \$5,500 a year. In addition to that he receives, I understand, longevity pay amounting to 40 per cent of his regular salary.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; he does not get any "foggy" pay, as it is called.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood he did.

Mr. HULL. No, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, then, as a brigadier-general he would retire on three-fourths of his salary of \$5,500. As a major-general he will retire on three-fourths of \$7,500.

Now, here is the whole proposition presented to us. The Government of the United States is not supposed to pay officers in any branch of its service unless they render value received. In other words, this Government is not supposed to grant to its citizens annuities, bounties, gratuities. It is not in conformity with our ideas of a republican form of government. Of course I know that there are other governments which do this. The English Government does that. It is talking now about granting a great gratuity to General Kitchener when he returns to England for defeating the Boers in their effort to maintain their liberty. Those things are done by other governments, but it is not supposed to be done by our Government.

Now, no matter what the services of General Sternberg are, how valuable they have been, this bill, as my friend from Virginia [Mr. HAY] says—and I am not disposed to lecture anybody, but I can not agree with some of my friends here who think that a member of this House ought to shut his brains and his mind when a committee comes in here and brings in a report, whether they agree with him or not, and if I am on a committee and make a report to this House I am perfectly willing for every other member

of the House to disagree with it, and I claim only that privilege to myself—

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I did not claim that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am referring to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON]. All I say is this: General Sternberg has been promoted in the service to the highest rank of his corps; he has received all the honors that this Government has ever bestowed on any man occupying his position, and there are great men who have filled the place.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. VANDIVER. How long has the valuable service of General Sternberg's continued that it should merit such great promotion?

Mr. CAPRON. Forty-one years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman has been in the Army for forty-one years. I do not know how long he has been serving as Surgeon-General, but from all the reports I say he has been an able and efficient officer.

Mr. CLAYTON. He has been Surgeon-General nine years.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not question that, but I do say that when you go out of your way to grant him this gratuity, to make him a major-general simply because there is a sentiment worked up in the United States for that purpose, a manufactured sentiment, then you simply open the door to have the brigadier-general who is the head of the Commissary Department of the Army, and the brigadier-general who is the head of the Quartermaster-General's Department, and every other brigadier-general who heads a great department in the Army of the United States, to come here with his friends to tell you what efficient services he has rendered to the Army and to the Government of the United States and ask you to give him for the balance of his life \$2,000 additional pay to that which he contracted to receive when he entered the service, and which the Government of the United States contracted to pay him. There is no reason on earth why this man should be given this gratuity, except that you say you give it to him because he is a good fellow, and has friends among the physicians of this country, scattered between two great oceans.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman slightly misunderstood my question. I mean how long has he been in the service in his present rank?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. About nine years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT].

Mr. JETT. Mr. Speaker, I think that most every member of this House has known my position upon the question of the retirement of Army officers. I did on one occasion express myself very freely in relation to this subject, but in this particular case I am in favor of extending this honor to the Surgeon-General of the Army, General Sternberg. It is not because of the fact that I desire to give him more money, but it is because of the fact that I think he is entitled to this recognition for the great aid and assistance which he has rendered to humanity, and if any gentleman who is opposing this bill will undertake to and make that character of investigation that this committee has made, I feel sure that he will reach the same conclusion that the members of the committee have reached.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word in conclusion, and especially in reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as to the amount of pay. It is the advancement of one grade for General Sternberg if this bill shall pass the House; it is an increase of pay of \$1,500 a year, three-quarters of the difference between a major-general and a brigadier-general, and I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that the total pay on the retired list, if this bill shall pass the House, as I figure it, would be \$5,625 a year. And if you will take into consideration the distinguished ability of this man, his long service, his contributions to the cause of science, no man in this House will believe for a moment that in private life he could not have made seven or eight times as much as his salary as an Army officer.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then, why did he not get out and go at it?

Mr. HULL. The point as to the pay, in my judgment, has nothing to do with this question. It is a question of recognizing the Surgeon-General of the Army in a small way.

Mr. CLAYTON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. HULL. No.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. HULL. Not for the present. I will in a minute. The question before this House is whether a man of forty-one years' service—nine years as Surgeon-General of the Army, with distinguished service in the cause of science—shall receive a recognition at the time of his retirement that will place him on an equality with his brother officer of the Navy. That is the main

question here. I think he has earned it, and I do not believe this House is establishing a dangerous precedent when it grants it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understand the gentlemen who have participated in this debate to say that this is a new case; that this has never been done before with regard to any officer of this grade in this branch of the service.

Mr. HULL. I will say to the gentleman that since I have been on the committee I do not remember any case where a bill has passed Congress providing that a man on retirement should be advanced a grade—that is, an individual bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. Then it is a reward for some peculiarly distinguished service. It is our method of decorating an officer because of something remarkable that he has done in his service. Now, will the gentleman kindly point out to the House what this particular officer has done in the way of great contributions to science; not in general terms, but what he has done? That is what I want to know.

Mr. HULL. Well, I will say, for one thing, that the administration of the Army, after the organization was completed, not in the first stage, when we multiplied our Army ten times, but after the system had been devised, has been such that the percentage of sickness in the Philippines has been less than in any other army that we have ever had.

Mr. CAPRON. Will my friend yield for a moment?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. CAPRON. I should like to state to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], in answer to his inquiry as to what the Surgeon-General has done that was remarkable in advancing the cause of science, that if he had only done the one thing of discovering, by his examination and careful investigation, a method of destroying yellow fever in the island of Cuba by destroying the mosquito which carried the yellow-fever germ, that would have been sufficient to decorate him as a man entitled to the highest place in medical science in the whole world.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the medical profession give this gentleman the credit of that discovery?

Mr. CAPRON. I understand that it is generally accredited to General Sternberg by the entire medical profession.

Mr. HEPBURN. I never heard of it before.

Mr. CAPRON. There are a great many things the gentleman never heard of before.

Mr. HULL. It does seem to me that the importance of this bill is not of that overpowering nature that men should be afraid of making a precedent of it. So far as I am concerned, since Congress passed the Navy personnel bill, by which every man who served in the Navy during the civil war and was in the Navy at the time of the passage of the bill was entitled to promotion one grade on retirement, I have been in favor of giving the Army equal credit and equal honor.

The Committee on Military Affairs have practically decided against that, and, through the action of the minority largely, have decided in favor of letting each individual stand upon his own merits; and with that idea in view this bill is brought before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. The time for debate on both sides has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to suspend the rules and take from the Speaker's table the bill which is under consideration and pass the same.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HULL demanded a division.

Mr. UNDERWOOD demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 69, nays 102, answered "present" 11, not voting 169; as follows:

#### YEAS—69.

Adamson,	Eddy,	Mondell,	Steele,
Alexander,	Esch,	Moody, N. C.	Stewart, N. J.
Allen, Me.	Evans,	Moody, Oreg.	Storm,
Bates,	Fletcher,	Mudd,	Sulloway,
Brick,	Graham,	Overstreet,	Tawney,
Brownell,	Greene, Mass.	Parker,	Taylor, Ohio
Brown,	Grosvenor,	Patterson, Pa.	Taylor, Ala.
Brownlow,	Hamilton,	Payne,	Tompkins, Ohio
Burton,	Haskins,	Prince,	Van Voorhis.
Capron,	Hay,	Ray, N. Y.	Vreeland,
Connell,	Hull,	Reeves,	Wadsworth,
Coombs,	Jenkins,	Rumple,	Wanger,
Corliss,	Jett,	Shafroth,	Warnock,
Cousins,	Ketcham,	Showalter,	Watson,
Cushman,	Lessler,	Sibley,	Woods.
Dalzell,	Littlefield,	Smith, Iowa	
Deemer,	Livingston,	Southwick,	
Draper,	McLachlan,	Sperry,	

#### NAYS—102.

Ball, Tex.	Bowie,	Burnett,	Cochran,
Barney,	Breazeale,	Candler,	Cooney,
Bartlett,	Brundidge,	Cannon,	Cowherd,
Bell,	Burgess,	Cassingham,	Cromer,
Bellamy,	Burkett,	Clark,	Crumpacker,
Bowersock,	Burleson,	Clayton,	Davis, Fla.



De Armond,	Kehoe,	Moss,	Smith, Ky.
Edwards,	Kern,	Needham,	Smith, H. C.
Finley,	Kitchin, Claude,	Neville,	Spight,
Fitzgerald,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Nevin,	Stark,
Gaines, W. Va.	Kleberg,	Perkins,	Stephens, Tex.
Gibson,	Lamb,	Pierce,	Sutherland,
Glenn,	Landis,	Powers, Mass.	Thayer,
Green, Pa.	Lanham,	Randell, Tex.	Thomas, Iowa
Hanbury,	Latimer,	Ransdell, La.	Tirrell,
Haugen,	Lawrence,	Reeder,	Tompkins, N. Y.
Henry, Conn.	Little,	Rhea,	Underwood,
Henry, Miss.	Lloyd,	Richardson, Tenn.	Vandiver,
Hepburn,	McCall,	Rixey,	Wachter,
Hitt,	McCulloch,	Robinson, Nebr.	Warner,
Hooker,	McLain,	Ryan,	Williams, Ill.
Howard,	McRae,	Shallenberger,	Williams, Miss.
Irwin,	Maddox,	Sims,	Wooten.
Johnson,	Merced,	Slayden,	
Jones, Va.	Minor,	Small,	
Jones, Wash.	Morgan,		

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—11.

Gilbert,	Knapp,	Naphen,	Wheeler,
Griggs,	Lacey,	Rucker,	Wright.
Grow,	McClellan,	Thompson,	

## NOT VOTING—100.

Acheson,	Dick,	Joy,	Powers, Me.
Adams,	Dinsmore,	Kahn,	Pugsley,
Allen, Ky.	Dougherty,	Kluttz,	Richardson, Ala.
Aplin,	Douglas,	Knox,	Robb,
Babcock,	Dovener,	Kyle,	Roberts,
Ball, Del.	Driscoll,	Lassiter,	Robertson, La.
Bankhead,	Elliott,	Lester,	Robinson, Ind.
Bartholdt,	Emerson,	Lever,	Ruppert,
Beidler,	Feely,	Lewis, Ga.	Russell,
Belmont,	Fleming,	Lewis, Pa.	Scarborough,
Benton,	Flood,	Lindsay,	Schirm,
Bingham,	Foerderer,	Littauer,	Scott,
Bishop,	Fordney,	Long,	Selby,
Blackburn,	Foss,	Loud,	Shackleford,
Blakeney,	Foster, Ill.	Loudenslager,	Shattuc,
Boreing,	Foster, Vt.	Lovering,	Shelden,
Boutell,	Fowler,	McAndrews,	Sheppard,
Brantley,	Fox,	McCleary,	Sherman,
Bristow,	Gaines, Tenn.	McDermott,	Skiles,
Broussard,	Gardner, Mich.	Mahon,	Smith, Ill.
Bull,	Gardner, N. J.	Mahoney,	Smith, S. W.
Burk, Pa.	Gill,	Mann,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Burke, S. Dak.	Gillet, N. Y.	Marshall,	Snodgrass,
Burleigh,	Gillet, Mass.	Martin,	Snook,
Butler, Mo.	Goldfogle,	Maynard,	Southard,
Butler, Pa.	Gooch,	Metcalfe,	Sparkman,
Calderhead,	Gordon,	Meyer, La.	Stevens, Minn.
Caldwell,	Graff,	Mickey,	Stewart, N. Y.
Cassel,	Griffith,	Miers, Ind.	Swanson,
Conner,	Hall,	Miller,	Talbert,
Conry,	Heatwole,	Moon,	Tate,
Cooper, Tex.	Hedge,	Morrell,	Thomas, N. C.
Cooper, Wis.	Hemenway,	Morris,	Tongue,
Creamer,	Henry, Tex.	Mutchler,	Trimble,
Crowley,	Hildebrandt,	Newlands,	Weeks,
Currier,	Hill,	Norton,	White,
Curtis,	Holliday,	Olmsted,	Wiley,
Dahle,	Hopkins,	Otjen,	Wilson,
Darragh,	Howell,	Padgett,	Young,
Davey, La.	Hughes,	Palmer,	Zenor.
Davidson,	Jack,	Patterson, Tenn.	
Dayton,	Jackson, Kans.	Pearre,	
De Graffenreid,	Jackson, Md.	Pou,	

So the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected, two-thirds not voting in favor thereof.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. LESTER, for this day.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. JOY with Mr. LEVER.

On this vote:

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. LACEY with Mr. SNODGRASS.

Mr. DAHLE with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. GILL with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. HEMENWAY with Mr. MAHONEY.

Mr. MANN with Mr. MICKEY.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was listening for my name, and it was not called. I wish to vote.

The name of Mr. RANDELL of Texas was called, and he voted "nay."

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL]. I am informed that he is not present, and I therefore desire to change my vote from "nay" to "present."

The name of Mr. GRIGGS was called, and he voted "present."

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as "present."

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman vote?

Mr. McCLEARY. I did not.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman listening to his name, when his name was called?

Mr. McCLEARY. I was temporarily out of the Hall, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no more right to be recorded "present" than to vote. The condition to enable him to vote is that he must be able to say that he was in his place and listening

when his name was called, and if he was unable to hear it he would have been entitled to vote.

Mr. McCLEARY. I was in during a part of the roll, but not when my name was called.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On May 31, 1902:

H. R. 8466. An act granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;

H. R. 9226. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;

H. R. 9249. An act granting a pension to Amos Allport;

H. R. 9928. An act granting pension to Benjamin E. Styles;

H. R. 11343. An act granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;

H. R. 12685. An act granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;

H. R. 13350. An act granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;

H. R. 13807. An act granting a pension to Jeremiah Horam;

H. R. 14099. An act granting a pension to Samantha B. Van

Brocklin;

H. R. 8921. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse

C. Rhodabeck;

H. R. 9437. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias

A. Calkins;

H. R. 9569. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert

Beits;

H. R. 9926. An act granting an increase of pension to James

F. Patton;

H. R. 10165. An act granting an increase of pension to Delia

E. Slocum;

H. R. 10201. An act granting an increase of pension to Otis

R. Freeman;

H. R. 10731. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel

P. Milburn;

H. R. 11285. An act granting an increase of pension to William

Sheldon;

H. R. 11644. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar

A. Hamilton;

H. R. 11921. An act granting an increase of pension to George

W. De Graw;

H. R. 12012. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter

C. Tuttle;

H. R. 13753. An act granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

H. R. 12778. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward

R. Blair;

H. R. 12458. An act granting an increase of pension to William

M. Barstow;

H. R. 12562. An act granting an increase of pension to William

H. Temple;

H. R. 12780. An act granting an increase of pension to William

H. Wheeler;

H. R. 13132. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie

Cotter;

H. R. 13162. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustin

M. Adams;

H. R. 13249. An act granting an increase of pension to Ada

Trowbridge;

H. R. 13265. An act granting an increase of pension to John

Whalen;

H. R. 13266. An act granting an increase of pension to Elbert

N. Remson; and

H. R. 13503. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles

Haltenhof.

## TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FOREST RESERVES TO THE CONTROL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it shall be in order immediately upon the adoption of this resolution to take up and consider in the House, as in the Committee of the Whole, the bill (H. R. 11536) entitled "A bill to transfer certain forest reserves to the control of the Department of Agriculture, to authorize game and fish protection in forest reserves, and for other purpose," and consider the same until disposed of by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LACEY. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Tennessee are recognized.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been on the Calendar since last March, but instead of moving to suspend the rules and pass the bill with the amendments it was thought best that it be

considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, because there might be some additional amendments suggested, and some question as to some amendments. I will say briefly in outlining this bill that it is a measure that was introduced to carry out the suggestion of the President in his message to Congress last December. The details of the bill, briefly, are these: There are certain reservations that have been fully surveyed, their boundaries definitely established, and their permanency agreed upon. There are certain other forest reserves whose boundaries are yet in process of alignment.

This proposition is to permit the President to issue an Executive order and transfer to the Department of Agriculture such of the reservations only as have been finally and fully established as to their boundary lines. It also provides, second, that with the consent or at the request of the governor of any State in which a forest reserve is located the whole or a part of such reservation may be set apart as a game preserve. Now, practically these are the two features of this bill. At the present we have two bureaus of forestry, one under the Department of the Interior and the other under the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture is better adapted for the permanent care and permanent protection of such of the reserves as have been fully and finally established as to their boundaries. On the other hand, as to those reservations whose boundaries are still in process of delimitation, the Department of the Interior is now the better to control the same.

In a general way this bill provides for these two matters. As to creating forest reserves or transferring them or portions of them into game preserves, it was thought best not to attempt to do that in any State without the consent of the State. That would result, first, in having a concerted action on the part of the State and a mutuality of action which would lead to harmony and prevent the establishment of such reserves where they are not wanted.

On the other hand, it would enable the Executive, with the consent of the governor of the State, to set apart one of these reserves in each State or a part thereof, or even more if the governor of the State should so agree, as a haven of refuge in which the wild animals and birds could breed and from that point spread out over the State. This would not interfere with the other uses of the forest reserve. In other words, it would set apart a breeding ground where desired by States for that purpose. This is practically all there is in this bill, and with this explanation I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LACEY. I will yield.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Does this change the law with reference to mining upon the reserves?

Mr. LACEY. It does not.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand that at present the forest reserves are subject to the mining laws.

Mr. LACEY. They are.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And this makes no change?

Mr. LACEY. No change of any existing law except it transfers the control and administration to the Department of Agriculture, and as to allowing the whole or a part of such reserve as the State may desire to be set apart as a game reserve. I would suggest, in answer to my friend from Texas, that this bill under this resolution will be read in the House as in Committee of the Whole, and give full opportunity to look at all the details of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Will not the gentleman from Iowa modify his motion to suspend the rules and let the bill be considered in the Committee of the Whole House?

Mr. LACEY. Instead of in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; for this reason: For the first time I have read it—not thoroughly, but only glanced at it—and it seems to me that there ought to be some general debate on it. It seems to me there ought to be that freedom of amendment and discussion that would come in the Committee of the Whole House. This legislation goes a long way, as my friend knows. It may be that it is wise, but it creates a forestry bureau in the Agricultural Department—

Mr. LACEY. Oh, my friend is mistaken about that.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it transfers it—

Mr. LACEY. That bureau has been in existence for years.

Mr. CANNON. It transfers the forest reserves of a certain kind to the Agricultural Department and it keeps the forest reserves of another kind in the Department of the Interior. In addition to that it comes with a wonderful sweeping provision in some of its criminal features; by regulation of the Department the regulation becomes law with a penalty, and it provides further, among other things, in the broadest possible way, that reserves

may be set aside for the protection of game and preservation of animals that are about to disappear. It provides in the broadest possible way for keepers and all that kind of thing, and section 8 does what I have never known to be done in my recollection; it says that all costs and expenses arising in cases under this act and properly chargeable to the United States shall be certified, approved, and paid as like costs and expenses in the courts of the United States are certified and approved of under the laws of the United States.

Mr. LACEY. I will say to my friend from Illinois, in answer to that suggestion, that section 8 is existing law, and it was put in there out of caution so as to make it certain that no different method of accounting would be required from that under existing law.

Mr. CANNON. And yet section 8 is broad enough and has that wonderful power that is meant, as I understand it, to do anything and everything; it provides for agents and regulations, preservations, and having costs certified and paid. I do not speak of that as an argument against the bill. It may be that it is absolutely proper; I am not prepared to say in two minutes that it is not; but I make the remark to see if the gentleman is not willing to modify his motion and let us consider the matter in Committee of the Whole. I would be glad if the gentleman could see his way to modify his motion and let this very important matter be considered as it should be in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if this goes into Committee of the Whole, it may not be passed by a majority vote?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, this is a motion to suspend the rules to consider, and it takes two-thirds to do that. It would take two-thirds to send it to the Committee of the Whole. Of course it takes two-thirds to suspend the rules. I am not antagonizing, so far as I am concerned, the consideration of the measure; I am willing that it be considered; but I believe it is of so much importance that I will again ask my friend [Mr. LACEY] if he will not modify his motion.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, personally, of course, I would be quite as willing to have the bill considered in Committee of the Whole as considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. I see substantially no difference.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that it will require unanimous consent for the gentleman to modify his motion now.

Mr. LACEY. I will then ask unanimous consent to make the modification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] asks unanimous consent to modify his motion so as to move that the bill be considered in Committee of the Whole instead of being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. [A pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and that modification is made.

Mr. LACEY. Now, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. If the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa in its present form be adopted the bill will be considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, not in the House as in Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Iowa reserves his time.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. If I understand, the question as now presented to us in parliamentary form is about this: Those who are opposed to the passage of this measure should vote against the adoption of the resolution as it now comes before us—that is, should vote against considering the bill in the Committee of the Whole—because if this resolution be defeated the bill can not be considered at all to-day except by unanimous consent, which, I take it, can not be obtained. A vote of two-thirds, therefore, against the adoption of this rule will defeat the bill. If, however, the proposed rule should be adopted and the House should consider the bill in Committee of the Whole, then, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], a majority of the House can, if they see fit, pass the bill in the Committee of the Whole and also in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LACEY. And it would be subject to amendment in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Of course, as are all other bills. But the point I wish to emphasize is that if it is desired to defeat the measure those who wish to defeat it would do so most effectually by voting against the adoption of this rule, which, as has been stated, will require a two-thirds vote.

I am not familiar enough with the provisions of the bill to discuss it fully on its merits; but it seems to me it is a bill of too much importance to be considered any other way than in Committee of the Whole House. The bill increases the number of officers; it transfers various matters pertaining to the forest reserves now belonging to the Interior Department to the Agricultural Department; but it does not transfer the whole subject-matter. The result, it seems to me, would be that we should have



a part of this forest-reserve business administered in the Agricultural Department and another part in the Interior Department, and, as stated in the views of the minority, which I have glanced at hastily, this arrangement must result in great confusion.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It seems also to contemplate that the State or Territorial laws shall have jurisdiction over certain offenses committed in these reserves, while the Federal courts shall have jurisdiction of certain other offenses.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I noticed that also. It seems to me the bill will make such confusion as to render it almost impossible to administer affairs properly in the two departments.

I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the West are opposed generally to any change in this respect. I can certainly say that such is the sentiment of my own district. We have had up the question of these timber reserves for the last eight or nine years. It has been a constant trouble to everybody. We have, with great patience and endurance, found out what the theory of the Secretary of the Interior is. We have now come to a point where we can deal with him. But it is proposed now to divide the authority—to give the Secretary of the Interior one part of the administration and to confer jurisdiction for another portion upon the Agricultural Department. We are to learn and conform to another chief's ideas of running these reserves and be a shuttlecock between the two departments.

There are 46,000,000 acres of public domain in these reservations. This tract includes practically every stick of timber in certain counties, so that there is no chance to get a load of wood except off of one of these reservations. It takes all the grazing ground of a number of counties. When these great reserves were set apart we were told they would only be used as conservators of the water and our rights to graze would not be disturbed. That policy has been changed several times, and now this bill purposes converting it into game preserves, buffalo farms, etc. For years a company has been pleading with Congress for a lease of a million acres of Government ground for a buffalo pasture and many members favored giving it to them. This bill provides for such a scheme. We want none of it in Colorado.

Now, we have reached some kind of a conclusion with the Secretary of the Interior, with great trouble and after long delay. As a result of the delay and the troubled condition the settlers generally are now so prejudiced against these reservations in Colorado that they are, as it were, up in arms for the repeal of every reservation in the State. These reservations are the subject of enmity on the part of the people. You establish a lot of English game preserves for the sporting elements of the country and no uncertain sound will come from the deluded settlers that you led into such a trap. Now, if I have time, I would like to have read at the Clerk's desk what the secretary of the Live Stock Association says about these reservations. We had this question up before the Committee on the Public Lands three or four days ago upon a leasing bill.

I hope I may have time to have read this letter, which gives the ideas of the Live Stock Association whose stock grazes on these lands that are included in these reservations. These are the persons who were enticed into, in a manner, acquiescing in the reservations on the repeated assurance that the Government would make no use of ground, but would protect the timber as a conservator of the water supply and permit the usual grazing privileges on the public domain. This letter gives the local opinions as to this policy and how it has developed. I suppose now the fish, game, and buffalo preserve must take the place of the cow, horse, and sheep, that the necessities of the poor shall be subverted for the amusement of those with much leisure to pleasantly dispose of.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,  
Denver, Colo., May 23, 1902.

Hon. JOHN C. BELL,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I desire to sincerely thank you for your statement made before the House Committee on Public Lands yesterday in reference to the matter of forest reserves.

You were perfectly correct in your statement that the Western people are opposed to any extension of these reserves, and also bitterly opposed to the mistaken proposition of the Government in excluding live stock from the reserves already set aside.

I have traveled all over the Western States and Territories during the past four years in connection with the work of this association, and there is not a live stock organization in the West that has not and would again pass resolutions opposing these two propositions. In the first place, these reserves are usually set aside upon the petition of the National Forestry Association, with headquarters in some codfish district in Massachusetts or Maine, the members of which know no more about the Western conditions and Western reservations than a Filipino does about Latin. These petitions are backed up by secretaries of perfunctory chambers of commerce and commercial organizations, who generally bring about the order of the Government, which is not opposed by stockmen for the reason that they are too busy with their duties on the ranges and ranches.

In Utah you are aware that there recently has been 2,000,000 acres of land withdrawn from the Uinta Mountains. This is the only tract of land in the mountains of Utah that has not already been set aside as a reserve. If this territory is set aside as a reserve, there will be no land in the State of Utah in which stock can graze in the summer time, it being impossible for them to live in the deserts. This will be a severe blow to the live-stock industry of Utah. In the sand hills of western Nebraska they have withdrawn vast tracts of sand hills for the purpose of a reservation. There is not a tree on hundreds of miles of this land, and never will be. It is only fit for grazing purposes, and never will be fit for anything else.

These reservations generally include tracts of agricultural and grazing lands, and the exclusion of stock from the use of these grasses is a hardship upon the stockmen at this time when grazing land and grasses are so scarce.

There is only one section in the West that I know of where the people seem to be in favor of the extension of reservations, and that is in a portion of Wyoming.

Yours, very truly,

C. F. MARTIN, *Secretary*.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this bill is one of very great importance, and the questions involved in it should be carefully considered before action is taken. The committee was not unanimous in its opinion relative to this matter. A minority report was made and signed by four of the members of the committee. We believe that it involves, as has been already stated, an unnecessary multiplication of offices, and it seems to me that the proposition involved in this bill is like taking the mountain to Mahomet instead of Mahomet to the mountain.

In the Department of the Interior we have different bureaus and divisions, with the officers looking after the public lands today, not only the public lands within the forest reserves, but the public lands outside of the forest reserves. In the Department of Agriculture there is one bureau looking after forestry, especially in its scientific aspect. Now, the proposition of this bill is not to take the one bureau or one division in the Department of Agriculture and put it in the Department of the Interior, where they have the officers already adapted to looking after the public domain, but it is to take the business of the Interior Department over to the Department of Agriculture, where they have but the one bureau. Then we will have two rival jurisdictions, you might say; in other words, they do not take from the Department of the Interior the questions relating to the adjudication and care of public lands and forests outside of the forest reserves, but they do take from it the care of the lands and forests in the reserves.

The Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture under this bill would simply have charge of the lands within the forest reserves, and the forests outside of the reserves would be still left to the Department of the Interior. Now, it seems to me that if we are going to make any change in this matter at all it were better to leave the forests as they are now, already in charge of the Interior Department, where they have all the officers and all the machinery necessary to care for it, and transfer the Bureau of Forestry of the Agricultural Department to the Interior Department. If they need more help, if they need another bureau, put it in the Department of the Interior. If any transfer ought to be made, it seems to me that the Bureau of Forestry ought to be taken from the Agricultural Department, with its officers, and placed under the Department of the Interior.

The Interior Department has its rangers, forest superintendents, and all its officers to look after the putting out of fires. They can go outside of the forest reserves onto the public lands generally, and it seems to me if we make this change we will still have to keep these officers to look after the forests of the public lands outside of the reserves. In other words, we would have a duplication of officers and a duplication of expenses that we have now. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, there are two parts of this bill which treat of entirely separate subjects. If this were simply the establishment in forest reserves of game reserves, I would have no objection to the bill, but the provision which is contained in the first section of this bill is that there shall be transferred from the Interior Department the administration of the forest reserves of this Government, namely, 46,000,000 acres of forests. We have now a complete corps of officers to attend, not only to the forest reserves, but also to the entire forest public lands, and they consist of 531 employees, most of them called rangers.

For the Government now to transfer to the Agricultural Department the care of the forest reserves would of necessity require the creation of a new force. In other words, the Agricultural Department would have control of a certain part of the public domain and still the rangers in the Interior Department would be retained in order to take care of and prevent forest fires on the public lands that are not within the forest reserves. Consequently, it creates rival jurisdictions and rival bureaus. Here is a line which marks the space between the forest reserve and the public forest timber not in the forest reserves.

The Agricultural Department would have jurisdiction of all

trespasses, of all offenses committed on one side of that line, and on the other side of that line the Interior Department would have jurisdiction. The result would be that you would have to nearly double your force in order to get a proper and efficient administration of both the public land and the forest reserves. Besides that, there are certain legal questions always arising, questions as to whether a man has complied with the terms of the homestead law or the terms of any other law under which he has attempted to gain title to the land, or whether or not he has committed a trespass upon either the public lands or upon the forest reserves, and consequently you will have conflicting policies and conflicting jurisdiction arise.

It is true that there is in the Agricultural Department what is called a Forestry Bureau, and a very excellent one of its kind; but that bureau was not inaugurated for the purpose of attending to these large tracts of land. Its duties relate more to the issuing of scientific works on how properly to plant and rear forests, and at what stage timber ought to be cut. Its work is more in the nature of scientific work than the personal supervision of these reserves. When legal questions arise as to whether a person is entitled to land under a certain law of the United States, whether it is in these reservations or upon the public domain, that question goes to the Interior Department for settlement. In other words, they have a complete machinery there now, not only for the purpose of administering the laws, but also for policing the forest reserves and the other public lands covered with forests. It seems to me that to divide this, to say that 46,000,000 acres in tracts scattered over the country should be transferred to the Agricultural Department, would result in nothing but confusion.

If an officer of the United States found that somebody was doing something wrong on a forest reserve, he would not go to the Agricultural Department, because the legal machinery is not there; and in any other case where it was necessary to put the legal machinery of the Government into operation it would be necessary to go to the other Department. These officers would be answerable to the Agricultural Department, when the final determination of the matter would be in the Interior Department. So, it seems to me, it would result in nothing but confusion. It will result in bureaucracy. It will result in almost doubling the number of men who will be necessary properly to patrol these two different classes of public lands. For those reasons, it seems to me, the bill ought not to pass.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado one minute in which to answer the question of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has four minutes remaining.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I should like to ask the gentleman if this law is not intended further to protect the existing forests and to secure to coming generations the advantages incident to the preservation of those forests, and if the opposition to this bill in many parts of the West—I do not say in the gentleman's case—is not largely due to selfish business reasons?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; not in my judgment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am asking for information.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I am not opposing this upon the ground of any opposition to forest reserves. I am opposing it upon the ground that it is a multiplication of officers, and that you are dividing between two departments the questions that will arise instead of keeping them all under one central head.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will not the enactment of this law tend to preserve the forests?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; it has no provisions relating to preservation. It is only a question as to which of two departments shall control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has three minutes remaining.

Mr. LACEY. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes.

Mr. LACEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. NEEDHAM].

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Public Lands I am heartily in favor of this bill. It is here because of a specific recommendation of the President of the United States. I will ask the Clerk to read in my time that portion of the President's message dealing specifically with this subject.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At present the protection of the forest reserves rests with the General Land Office, the mapping and description of their timber with the United States Geological Survey, and the preparation of plans for their conservative use with the Bureau of Forestry, which is also charged with the general advancement of practical forestry in the United States.

These various functions should be united in the Bureau of Forestry, to which they properly belong. The present diffusion of responsibility is bad from every standpoint. It prevents that effective cooperation between the Government and the men who utilize the resources of the reserves, without which the interests of both must suffer. The scientific bureaus generally should be put under the Department of Agriculture. The President should have by law the power of transferring lands for use as forest reserves to the Department of Agriculture. He already has such power in the case of lands needed by the Departments of War and the Navy.

The wise administration of the forest reserves will be not less helpful to the interests which depend on water than to those which depend on wood and grass. The water supply itself depends upon the forest. In the arid region it is water, not land, which measures production. The western half of the United States would sustain a population greater than that of our whole country to-day if the waters that now run to waste were saved and used for irrigation. The forest and water problems are perhaps the most vital internal questions of the United States.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Now, Mr. Speaker, this bill simply authorizes the President by proclamation to transfer certain of the forest reserves of the country, which have been finally marked, to the Department of Agriculture to be administered by that Department. It does not transfer the question of titles or of legal administration, but simply the control and protection of the forests to the Agricultural Department; and, in my judgment, it will be a long step in advance in the cause of forestry protection. I believe the President was right when he recommended this specific legislation. This bill is before the House in accordance with the recommendation of the President, and I sincerely hope that it may become a law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why can not every advantage to be gained by this bill be gained by administering this in the Interior Department?

Mr. NEEDHAM. Because the Forestry Bureau is a scientific bureau, which studies the subject from a scientific standpoint, and the care of our forests properly belongs to this scientific bureau of the Government.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why would it not be better to transfer that scientific bureau to the Interior Department, which has the actual administration of the forests?

Mr. NEEDHAM. I think the answer is given in the President's message, because the scientific part certainly properly belongs to the Agricultural Bureau. I hope the bill will pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LACEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, without committing myself to all the provisions of this bill, I am unqualifiedly in favor of that provision which transfers the forestry division of the Interior Department to that of Agriculture. There is nothing whatever in the suggestion that this bill, if passed, will multiply offices. The Agricultural Department can administer and care for the forest reserves just as economically as the Interior Department, and I believe will get better results.

It ought to be transferred, because forestry is akin to agriculture; and if there is anything in the question of forestry, it should be taught by those interested in it. The people ought to be educated to the importance of forestry as a business. They ought to be made to understand that our trees are one of our greatest sources of wealth that now exists, and should be preserved, cultivated, and utilized in the most economical way. A proper administration of the national reserves will be an object lesson for all the people, and the department which will give the most attention to that feature of it is the one that ought to have the control of them.

The President is right in asking this transfer, and the public will sustain him in maintaining the reserves in a business-like way. We are wasting—we are wasting, I repeat—rapidly one of the great items of wealth by permitting our timber to be destroyed. In fifty years we will realize our mistake. This bill provides that no enlargement of a forest reserve nor a new one shall be made without the consent of the governor of the State, which does not exist in the present law, and in that respect defers to local sentiment more than the existing law.

Mr. RODEY. Why not have that right extended to the Territories?

Mr. McRAE. I am perfectly willing to do that. I presume, however, it was not done because the governor of a Territory is the creature of the President, while the governor of a State is not. What I want to emphasize more than anything else is this: We have started to establish and maintain forest reserves. Public sentiment justifies it, not only in the communities in which they exist, with few exceptions, but throughout the length and breadth



of our common country; and when the Interior Department has surveyed the boundaries and fixed the title, I think it should then turn the reserve over to the Agricultural Department to administer.

The work of one ceases where the other begins. When established we want men to handle it who can teach the agriculturists about the different kinds of timber, and the value of it, and how to utilize it, when to cut the trees, when it is ripe—how to utilize it so as to get the most out of it. In order to accomplish this result I am willing, if necessary, to array myself against those who want free grazing furnished by the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we ought not to hesitate to take up and consider this bill. If there is anything in it that gentlemen want to strike out, that can be done. There are some amendments that ought to be made, I know. I have one myself, but the administration should be in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, and then the gentleman from Iowa can conclude.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, the objection to the position of the gentleman from Arkansas is this: There is no objection to the transfer of the supervision of all public forest lands, including the forest reserves, to the Agricultural Department, if you will do it, or retain it in the Interior Department. Either is all right; but what I object to is cutting the lands in two, giving one-half of it to the Agricultural Department and half of it to the Interior Department. How can there be good administration of these forest reserves or the public land if you are going to have the administration of part of it in one department and part of it in another department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Are not all the forest reserves here set apart to be reserved as forest reserves transferred to this Bureau in the Agricultural Department?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And the only forests that are kept under the Interior Department are those that have not been made forest reserves and are still part of the public domain?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They are still a part of the public domain.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And subject to entry?

Mr. SHAFROTH. And subject to entry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And subject to be cleared for agricultural purposes?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then, not being forests, no part of the forestry question is concerned?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes; there are purely forestry questions concerning them, because you will find that a large part of the land called the public domain is like the forest reserves and never will be taken up, because not fit for agricultural purposes. When forest fires get in there they create as much havoc and destruction as when they get into the forest reserve. They are so similar you can not tell where the forest reserves end and the public forests begin, and consequently will have men patrolling one side of an imaginary line on the public land and yet in the forest reserves have another force. Conflicting administration and conflicting jurisdiction will surely result.

Mr. McRAE. Will the gentleman refer me to the statute appointing rangers except on forest reserves?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know as I can call the gentleman's attention to where it is, but they do supervise and do put out forest fires on all public lands, and my impression is there are forest rangers, not only for forest reserves, but for the public domain.

Mr. McRAE. I think the gentleman from Colorado is mistaken.

Mr. SHAFROTH. You will find them going onto the public domain and attempting to put out the fires there. They have a general supervision of all the timber of the country, and I know the Interior Department has a number of inspectors that go all over the country examining into cases of trespass and as to violation of the law as to leaving camp fires and as to forest fires, irrespective as to whether they were in the forest reservations or on the public domain.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman is referring to the inspectors of fraudulent titles.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, in the minute remaining I wish to say to the House that in the Committee of the Whole any question about the propriety of this bill that may come up, and any amendment that ought to be made can be presented. The only question now before the House is whether this measure, which was suggested by the President of the United States in his annual message, shall have the consideration of this House.

As to the character of that consideration, and the propriety of

passing the bill that matter can be fully considered when we get into Committee of the Whole. I hope we will have a unanimous vote to consider this bill. As to what finally to do with it will be a question the House, when it comes into committee, can consider, and in its wisdom will do what is right. The proposition to take care of the forest reserves is of vital importance and worthy of the highest consideration for the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and adopting the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFROTH) there were—93 ayes and 15 noes.

So (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9976) to encourage salmon culture in Alaska, and for the protection of persons engaged in the production thereof.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That any person or persons who heretofore or hereafter may establish and maintain a hatchery for the artificial production of salmon in the district of Alaska shall be entitled to the exclusive right of all fish that such hatchery may produce in excess of the normal product of such stream for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tide water from the mouth of the stream upon which such hatchery may be located.

Sec. 2. That when the average normal product of any stream on which a hatchery may be maintained shall have been taken within 1 mile of the mouth of said stream in any one year by any party or parties, then the remaining fish produced by said hatchery shall be the property of the owner or owners of said hatchery for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tide water from the mouth of said hatchery stream, and for a further distance of 4 miles in all directions in tide water it shall be unlawful for any party or parties to take fish of the kind propagated by the hatchery for whose protection this law is enacted.

Sec. 3. That in case other streams producing salmon of the same kind as those produced by the hatchery so protected shall intervene within a distance of 5 miles, then the normal product of such intervening stream shall be included in and added to the normal product of such hatchery stream, subject to the same conditions as are provided in section 2 of this act.

Sec. 4. That the provisions and immunities of this act shall apply to barren streams and lakes that shall have been stocked with fish from artificial hatcheries.

Sec. 5. That in case two or more persons shall maintain hatcheries on the same stream or stockbarren lakes or streams, such persons shall be entitled to their proportionate number of adult fish so produced, and each party shall file a sworn statement of his or their output of young fry with the nearest United States commissioner each year.

Sec. 6. That native Indians may at all times take sufficient fish for food or for drying for winter use as food for themselves or families, and fishing with the rod shall be open and free for all persons.

Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to grant leases in accordance with the foregoing sections of this act, for a period not to exceed twenty years from the time the product of their hatcheries shall return, to all persons producing satisfactory proof of having maintained hatcheries on any of the streams of Alaska not producing, in a normal state, more than 10,000 salmon of the kind propagated by said hatchery; such lease subject to renewal at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That before any such lease shall be granted the party or parties making application therefor shall accompany such application with proof sufficient to establish the normal product of such stream; and no person shall be entitled to more than one hatchery lease or the privilege of stocking more than three barren lakes or streams and being protected in the product thereof.

Corporations owning and operating canneries shall be entitled to one hatchery franchise for each cannery so operated, and no more. All hatcheries that may have been started and maintained on streams producing more than 10,000 salmon of the kind propagated prior to the passage of this act shall be entitled to all immunities of hatcheries established on streams producing not more than 10,000, as provided in this section.

Sec. 8. That all rights and privileges granted by this bill are subject to the supervision and regulation and repeal by Congress.

During the reading of the bill the following took place:

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this bill is not lawfully before the House, coming from the Committee on Territories. This is a bill relating to fish and fish culture, and is a general bill, and therefore I have the right to make the point of order at this time that it has no status here.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. But a motion to suspend the rules would suspend those rules.

Mr. SULZER. No doubt about that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio knows that on individual suspension day a bill may be brought up that never has been before any committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But this bill has been sent to a committee, and the wrong committee.

Mr. SULZER. I differ with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. That does not disqualify it. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois will control the time.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the House on two different occasions, and on both occasions has been

printed in full in the RECORD. The bill was discussed last week in the House.

Let me now reiterate that this bill was prepared with much care, scrupulously considered by the Committee on the Territories, and after a painstaking hearing unanimously reported to the House. No one who understands the question will honestly oppose this bill. The people of Alaska—those most interested—want this bill to pass. The Commissioner of Fisheries is in favor of the bill, the Treasury Department favors it, and so far as I am aware there is no opposition to it.

All that the bill does is to give the Secretary of the Treasury the right to grant a lease for a period of twenty years to those people who, at their own expense, establish in Alaska fish hatcheries for the artificial propagation of salmon. The bill leaves the whole matter in the hands of Congress to repeal, change, or amend the law at any time, and gives the discretionary power of granting these leases to the Secretary of the Treasury. The bill especially provides that no individual, company, or corporation shall have more than one lease. It does not interfere with line or fly fishing. It gives the natives the right to take all the salmon they want for food, summer or winter. It does not take a dollar from the public Treasury, gives no monopoly, and grants no special privilege.

It simply says if a man establishes a fish hatchery for the purpose of increasing by artificial propagation the normal supply of salmon at his own expense, that the Government, in its discretion, can grant him a lease, so that he will know that he will be protected in a small way and get some return for his energy, his expenditure, and his industry.

The salmon industry is one of the great industries in Alaska. A great many canneries have been established there, are being established there, and will continue to be established. At the present time millions of dollars are invested. The product of these canneries is one of the most valuable products of the district and one of the great products of this country. It foots up every year into millions and millions of dollars. Besides the monetary question involved in this matter as an industry of the United States, the great point that I wish to make is this: I am in favor of protecting the fish and game of America, and I have always, since I have been a legislator, in my State and here in Washington, done all that I could to accomplish that purpose. It is a sad commentary on our civilization that by reason of our lack of judgment and foresight we have allowed the most valuable fish of the Atlantic to be exterminated, and we have allowed the larger wild animals of our country to become practically extinct.

I have absolutely no personal interest in the matter other than as a believer in the theory, which is growing every day, that it is the duty of one generation to protect the natural food products for the next generation. I believe it is incumbent on us to protect the fish and game of our country for future generations. I believe we will be derelict in our duty to posterity if we fail to do this. Another thing, I am a disciple of Sir Izaak Walton and a true friend of the wild fish and game. I protest against their wanton slaughter. While in Alaska I visited several of the big canneries, and I am familiar with their operation. I have seen the way the fish are caught, prepared, and canned. I have also visited several of the hatcheries there and witnessed the way the salmon can be propagated, so that if the Government in some way will protect the people who are propagating salmon the fish will never become exterminated, and the supply, instead of diminishing, will undoubtedly be increased.

Of course, we know that canned salmon is one of the staple diets of the world, and I believe nine-tenths of the supply of the world is produced by the canneries of Alaska. I believe the statistics will show that for the last ten years the value of the supply of canned salmon that comes from Alaska will amount to several million dollars a year, and it will probably average a great deal more in the years to come, because new canneries are being established all the time.

This bill is intended to give a little protection to the men who are willing to invest their money in salmon fish hatcheries in Alaska for the purpose of propagating the salmon and increasing the supply, giving these men the privilege of catching part of the salmon that will come back.

Unless something is done to increase the normal supply, it will be only a few years when the salmon of Alaska will be exterminated. There was a time when salmon were just as plentiful on the Atlantic coast as they are to-day in the streams of Alaska. But to-day there are only two streams in this country on the Atlantic Ocean where salmon go. Those two streams are in Maine. And so, sir, if the ruthless destruction of salmon on the Pacific coast, especially in Alaska, goes on a few years more at the rate it is going on now, these valuable fish will ere long be as scarce on the Pacific as they now are on the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, I know about this matter. I am familiar with this subject. I have visited Alaska, and I have carefully looked

into this question. I have studied it. Every commercial body in Alaska, the people generally of Alaska, and the men who have established fish hatcheries there, all favor the passage of this bill. It is right, it is fair, it is just, it is honest, it is meritorious; and there ought to be absolutely no objection to it.

A peculiarity of the red salmon is that they will not frequent a stream unless it has a lake that they can reach, where they may lay and ripen before ascending to spawn in the small streams that put into the lake. Fully one-half of the small streams that produce a large percentage of the salmon of southeastern Alaska have no lakes on them, and fully three-fifths of those that have lakes are barred by falls between the lake and tidewater, over which fish can not pass; hence the scarcity of this valuable species of fish. The coho, dog, and humpback salmon, all inferior fish, take any stream on which there are spawning grounds. As a consequence they are very numerous and the valuable red salmon correspondingly scarce.

These valuable red salmon are fast becoming extinct, and, unless the Government institutes an extensive system of hatcheries and private parties are protected in the output of their hatcheries, the red salmon will in the near future be numbered with the buffalo. No private party, unless protected in the results of his industry, can withstand the enormous pressure of the great combine—the canning trust.

The proposed law simply gives to parties a legal right to property they create from the wastes of nature without taking anything of value from the public domain. If they produce ten where nature has produced but one, they surely should have the right to the increase. They also enrich the waters outside the protected zone by thousands of fish that will be public property.

Now, the propagator will not get all the fish—probably not more than one-half of the fish—outside of this protected zone. Others are there to take the fish, and everyone is free to take them, and inside the protected zone the normal quota of the stream is free to everybody until that amount is taken. When the salmon commence to run, under the provision of this law, the public would have free access to catch those salmon up to the normal quota of the stream, and that quota must be established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury, by proof that can not be disputed, before he will grant a lease.

There are thousands of streams and lakes in Alaska that are barren because of falls near tide water which no fish can pass on the upward passage. By stocking these streams with young fry you reclaim a desert, yet this can be accomplished, and the commercial results would be enormous. To accomplish this, however, entails considerable expense. No policy will advance the settlement of Alaska as much as that provided for in this bill. Every industrious fisherman can and many will embark in salmon culture, and in connection with his hatchery will develop what there may be of agricultural resources that will never be utilized except in connection with some auxiliary industry.

Mr. Kutchin, the agent in Alaska for the Treasury Department, appeared before the committee in favor of this bill. He is very familiar with this subject. It is his duty to be. He said:

I do not believe a regiment of men, under the existing law, can preserve the fisheries, for the reason that the machinery employed by the persons engaged in taking the fish is so stupendous that they will violate the spirit while preserving the letter of the law.

I have cudgelled my brain a long time for some remedy, and have reached the conclusion that it rests on abundant artificial propagation. We know the success in the propagation of shad and other fishes. The habits of the salmon are unknown and it is experimental, but nothing can be accomplished unless it is initiated, and presuming that what is believed to be the fact in regard to other fish is true of salmon, they should be propagated and should return to the parent stream. I think that is the only remedy.

Years ago the salmon rivers of Scotland were so teeming with salmon that the laboring men bargained that they should not be required to eat it more than three times a week. Now fresh salmon is a luxury for the rich, just as the whitefish on the lakes has become. They used to be packed in every little cove and port on Lakes Michigan and Superior, and now there are very few whitefish, and the packing of whitefish is almost gone.

History agrees in all particulars that inland fishing is subject to extermination, and I believe that this will be true as to the salmon in Alaska to-day, that they are doomed within a reasonable period—within the life of any person here present.

This bill, which we are here to discuss, is fair and equitable. I think that any man who is disposed to put in his time and money and effort should be protected, and I think this bill does it fairly and well, and that it does not encroach upon the rights of anybody. It does not give anybody the exclusive rights of streams.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few words more. The Committee on Territories carefully considered this bill and unanimously reported it. That committee made a report on this question of the salmon fisheries of Alaska, and any man who will read that report will find it both interesting and instructive. In my opinion it is the best and most exhaustive report that has ever been made on this great question—one of the greatest industries to-day in Alaska. Any man who will read this report and ascertain the facts will, I believe, favor this bill, unless he has some special interests to look after or wants to give the monopoly to the canning trust.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. CANNON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather remarkable piece of legislation. It is a radical change in the policy of this Government in the matter of fisheries. It is a proposition to establish a fish monopoly on the coast of Alaska. It is a proposition to transfer from the control of all the people the fisheries of that magnificent coast and put them under the control of a few canning companies.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] says he has been in Alaska. I have also had the pleasure of making an Alaskan trip, at the time that the gentleman from New York was there. At the time I was in Alaska a measure of this kind was being discussed by the canners. I was spoken to in regard to legislation of this character and the suggestion was made that it would be a good thing. I agree that it would be an excellent thing—for the companies which own canneries, for the men who annually outfit ships in California and Oregon, load them with Chinese, and proceed to the Northern seas to devastate the fisheries of that coast, the gentlemen who, contrary to the law, in defiance of the law, and in defiance of the rules and regulations established under the law, are depleting the fisheries of Alaska. This is a proposition to give them further opportunity to monopolize the fisheries of that coast. It is true that this bill—

Mr. SULZER rose.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman would not yield to me, and I must decline to yield. I have only five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I only wanted to know whether the gentleman had read the report. If he had done so, I do not think he could make the speech he is making.

Mr. MONDELL. It is true that this bill purports only to create a monopoly as to fish in excess of the "normal run." But who is going to decide what the "normal run" of the salmon in any of the streams of Alaska is? Who but the men who now are established there in the canning business and who will be the only parties interested in determining what the "normal run" is?

They having depleted the streams so that the run is small—much less than formerly—we are to allow these gentlemen to come in and prove the "normal run," and then by establishing a cannery at the mouth of a stream they are to have a monopoly of the stream for all time to come.

The gentleman from New York says that this monopoly will be only for twenty years; the bill says for twenty years from the time when the product of the hatcheries return. Who is going to decide when the product of these hatcheries are to return? Who is there on earth who is going to be able to determine when the spawn from these hatcheries, having gone to the deep sea, shall all have returned to the streams where they were hatched?

This bill establishes practically for all time a monopoly of the fisheries of that magnificent coast—not only the fisheries of the small streams, but the fisheries of the enormous streams like the Karluk, which now runs 2,000,000 per annum, it is said. Who is to determine what the "normal run" of that stream is? And the Karluk canneries having established a hatchery at the mouth of that stream, who is going to determine when the "normal run" of that stream is caught? Who is going to determine when the product of those hatcheries have all returned?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Have we not a governor up there who can make such a report?

Mr. MONDELL. We have a governor there, but I hardly think that the governor, though he is a very intelligent gentleman, will be able to tag all the small fry as they run into the sea and then determine when the last one has finally returned. I know and honor the governor, but he is finite; none but infinite wisdom could determine those facts.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why can not the governor make a report? We have increased his salary to \$5,000.

Mr. MONDELL. We have never had a report from the governor or anybody else advocating this sort of measure. The gentleman says that the agent of the Interior Department up there is favorable to it. The agent says that he does not believe that this is the way to settle the question of the depletion of the fisheries in Alaska. He says the proper method to pursue there, and I agree with him, is for the Government to establish hatcheries, for the Government to increase the number of fish on that coast, and I think the Government should do it by imposing a tax upon the canneries along the coast.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They certainly can get a report from the governor, and that is what the gentleman was inquiring about.

Mr. MONDELL. I have made no such inquiry.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I crave the attention of the House just for a few moments. This is like a great many other propositions that come on suspension day that you have got to catch on the fly. Sometimes it ought not to be caught. Other times it

ought to be caught. I think this is one of the times that the catcher ought to have on his gloves. Now, what does this bill do? First, how much country does it cover? In reply to that question, it covers the whole Alaskan coast, every stream that empties into the ocean—the whole shooting match—thousands and thousands of miles. Those waters are said to teem with salmon. I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] if he knows how many cannery establishments are up there now?

Mr. SULZER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. How many?

Mr. SULZER. There are 59 canneries in this country.

Mr. CANNON. Fifty-nine cannery establishments in Alaska, and it is alleged—I don't know whether it is true or not—that they are so improvident in the taking of the salmon that extermination is threatened. In other words, 59 people or 59 corporations, with their great canning establishments, are there on the ground and selfishly are about to destroy the very industry upon which they feed. Now, that is the allegation. How much truth there is in it I do not know. Now, what does this bill propose to do?

Mr. SULZER. And another thing that the gentleman from Illinois does not know is, he does not know anything about this bill or the report. The gentleman agreed to read the report when the bill was up in the House last week, and he has not read the report.

Mr. CANNON. I do not have to read the report to read, when I see the bill, what I believe to be improvident.

Mr. SULZER. Well, the gentleman ought to know what he is talking about.

Mr. CANNON. I think I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would point out, if he can, right in connection with what he is saying, what right the Government would have left to propagate fish up there after these rights were given to these canneries?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Now, what does the bill do? I quote from the language of the bill:

That any person or persons who heretofore or hereafter—

You catch them coming and going—

may establish and maintain a hatchery for the artificial production of salmon in Alaska, etc.

How big a hatchery? One-and-a-half-bushel box? One in a hoghead; one that will cost 30 cents; one that will cost \$10,000? The bill does not say. I say here for the expenditure of \$10 you can establish a hatchery. The bill is silent as to which kind of a hatchery. Now, what else?

Shall be entitled to the exclusive rights of all fish that such hatchery may produce in excess of the normal product of such stream for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tide water from the mouth of the stream upon which such hatchery may be located.

Now, where do they put their hatcheries? Down at the mouth of the stream, do they not?

Mr. SULZER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Well, near there.

Mr. SULZER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Near tide water.

Mr. SULZER. Not at all.

Mr. CANNON. Well, there is where they get these salmon.

Mr. SULZER. No; they do not get the salmon there, either. The gentleman is not familiar with this subject.

Mr. CANNON. The doctors seem to disagree about it.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman is not familiar with this subject.

Mr. CANNON. I am familiar enough to criticise this bill, and I am entitled to the right to do it, if it ought to be criticised.

Mr. SULZER. The gentleman criticises everything.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; I criticise every bill that in my judgment ought to be criticised, and there are a great number of them that do not get the criticism they might well have. [Applause.]

Shall be entitled to the exclusive right of all fish that such hatchery may produce in excess of the normal product of such stream for a distance of 1 mile in all directions in tidewater from the mouth of the stream upon which such hatchery may be located.

And yet my friend says they do not fish there. If they do not fish there, then it is a barren right, because the way of a fish in the sea is one thing that could not be found out in ancient times, as well as that of a serpent on a rock and a bird in the air.

Now, what next?

Sec. 3—

Now, listen:

Sec. 3. That in case other streams producing salmon of the same kind as those produced by the hatchery so protected shall intervene within a distance of 5 miles, then the normal product of such intervening stream shall be included in and added to the normal product of such hatchery stream, subject to the same conditions as are provided in section 2 of this act.

That is, you can put your hatchery on one stream, and if there is another within 5 miles you are entitled to the fish there,

because, I suppose, the fish might get mixed. Well, now, what next? Just listen:

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to grant leases in accordance with the foregoing sections of this act, for a period not to exceed twenty years from the time the product of their hatcheries shall return, to all persons producing satisfactory proof of having maintained hatcheries on any of the streams of Alaska not producing, in a normal state, more than 10,000 salmon of the kind propagated by said hatchery; such lease subject to renewal at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, here we are, four, or five, or six thousand miles away—the Lord knows how far, I do not. Who is to execute this law? The Treasury Department. How? Through its agents sent up there. Now, I have had some experience, and I do not have to read the report that the gentleman refers to. I have had experience and observation touching the Treasury Department in Alaskan waters.

Mr. OTJEN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. CANNON. In a moment. I have been helping make appropriations year in and year out touching the seal industry under the Treasury Department, and now I am not singling out any agent; but in that great industry I am here to say that in my opinion the heart of neglect, not to use a stronger term, has been found in that service about the Treasury agent. Why, he did not have to be greased to enable the parties in interest in catching seals to swallow him. [Laughter.] Now, you are going to establish these salmon fisheries and hatcheries and give this lease for twenty years, renewable for twenty years, to be placed under the Treasury Department, 2,000 miles from nowhere, and the agent of the Treasury Department becomes a means of oppression. You clothe these people with the right by this act to say, "We are here at the mouths of these streams and we are protected under the law and under our twenty years' lease," and the poor devil who wants to go there and make war against this monopoly will be in a pretty uncomfortable condition.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Did the gentleman notice that the report states that the salmon are supposed to return in about ten or eleven years to the place where they were hatched? Nobody knows just when, but that is the suggestion, and therefore, at the very least, the lease would be for thirty years, because the report gives ten years as the time when the first salmon would return.

Mr. CANNON. On this \$200 hatchery that is to be established, if it cost that much, I suppose they would be in the hatching business every year, and I suppose it would be practically in perpetuity.

Mr. MONDELL. And according to their own report they would have at least thirty years under the first lease, because the first fish do not return for ten years.

Mr. CANNON. In the meantime the people on the ground are in possession, running these 59 canneries for profit, and threatening to exterminate this industry by their greed. Now, you do not enforce the law against them, nay, nay; but you say in addition to that, "You may make your hatchery upon the stream and we will legalize your possession for twenty years by this lease."

Mr. OTJEN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. OTJEN. In order to select these fish that have been produced by the hatchery, ought not this bill to provide some means by which the fish could be branded?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, after all I want to treat the bill fairly. It attempts to do that. They say, "above the normal catch." Who gets the normal catch? Why, the corporation that is in possession gets the normal catch, does it not? The fellow who goes in and undertakes to get the normal catch against the man who has the right to be there under this lease to take all above the normal catch would have a pretty hard time of it, would he not?

Why, he would get h— up in that cold country. [Laughter.] Now, here is the whole thing. I want to speak respectfully of everybody. I am only stating how this appears to me. Oh, but the gentleman says I have not read the report. I have glanced at it. I am not industrious enough to read all the reports, and I have to take many things by reading the bill. It would take an angel of light, it would take a regiment of angels of light, with trumpets and shoutings and sweet music to convince me that this was a proper bill to pass after I have read it. [Laughter.] I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SULZER. How much time has the gentleman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. SULZER. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has sixteen minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the title of this measure is "A

bill to encourage salmon culture in Alaska, and for the protection of the persons engaged in the production thereof." Throughout my entire lifetime I have frequently experienced difficulty in attempting to talk upon subjects with which I was not familiar. I am laboring somewhat under that embarrassment upon this occasion. But having been requested to say a few words regarding this bill I will do so within the very narrow scope of my information upon the subject.

This bill, and the general consideration of the subject, came up before the Committee on Territories, of which committee I am a member. I have no interest in this bill nor the subject-matter to which it relates, more than the common patriotic interest possessed by every legislator here. Therefore I have no ambition and no desire to push through this House the legislation contained in this bill, if in the judgment of a majority here the bill ought not to pass.

We had before the Committee on Territories when we were considering this bill men who were familiar with the salmon fisheries in Alaska—men who were certainly competent and presumably honest. It was the judgment of these men that some legislation must be enacted, and enacted very soon, to encourage salmon culture in Alaska, or that very productive industry of that region will cease by reason of the total destruction of the salmon.

Now, it was the judgment of these men, as shown by their testimony, which in the form of a printed report is now before this House for consideration, that the provisions of this bill now before the House were both wise and fair, and if carried into legislation would greatly encourage the culture of salmon in Alaska.

It is a matter of common knowledge to every man on the Pacific coast that unless something is done to encourage the building of salmon hatcheries on that coast that that very valuable product of that region will soon become exhausted.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. As I understand, there are salmon fisheries in the gentleman's State and in the adjoining State. I want to ask the gentleman, if it is a fair question, if he would favor a bill of this character applied to his own State?

Mr. CUSHMAN. From my knowledge of the situation I certainly would. I certainly am not now engaged in trying to enact obnoxious legislation for other communities that I would object to if applied to my own.

Mr. MONDELL. You would be willing to have this provision extend to the State of Washington?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Yes, sir; I would. A number of men on this floor seem to oppose this bill because they seem to think it would, if enacted into law, tend to produce a monopoly in the salmon-fishing industry of Alaska. I believe that the men who oppose this bill on that ground are honest and sincere in their opposition, although I can not see the ground for their fears. Viewing this phase of the matter, it becomes important to know what constitutes a monopoly.

As to the establishment of future hatcheries, no man is named and no company is designated in this bill. The bill says whoever shall establish and maintain a hatchery shall have certain privileges. That language gives to every man on this floor the same right to establish a salmon hatchery in Alaska if he sees fit that is conferred on any other man. That certainly does not smack of monopoly. A bill that tends to create a monopoly is a bill that gives exclusive privileges to some people to the exclusion of all others. I believe that a man who puts his labor, his brains, and his money into a productive proposition has a right to have certain advantages in reaping the rewards of that enterprise that other people who hazarded nothing in the venture do not have.

Now, that is all there is in this bill. The man who spends his money in planting a salmon hatchery where there was none before under the terms of this bill is given a right to secure a part of the fish that his industry helps to create. No man would contend that a man who sowed a field in the spring in order that he might reap the harvest thereof in autumn was creating a monopoly. He is simply creating wealth by his individual industry, and the law, written and unwritten, gives such a man a first mortgage on the fruits of his own industry.

There is little or no difference, in my judgment, between that proposition and the one we are now considering. The same logic can readily be applied to both propositions. One man sows grain on barren land and reaps the harvest. The other man sows fish in a barren stream and asks that he be permitted not to reap the entire results thereof, but only a part. That don't seem to me to bear any resemblance to a monopoly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Certainly.



Mr. GROSVENOR. Take the first section of this bill, which provides—

That in case other streams producing salmon of the same kind as those produced by the hatchery so protected shall intervene within a distance of 5 miles, then the normal product of such intervening stream shall be included in and added to the normal product of such hatchery stream.

Suppose a stream in Alaska—and I assume that there are a great many of them that have never had any salmon produced on them—and the hatchery starts up there and puts in its small fry, and then proposes that for twenty years under this bill it shall have the normal product—that is, all above the normal product. Well, now, there is no normal product. And how is the Government to plant that stream in small fry and produce salmon if somebody is to come in and be entitled to all above the normal product? Does not that exclude the Government from planting fish in that stream?

Mr. CUSHMAN. Perhaps it does; but if that stream has existed a barren stream through all these years up to the present time, and the Government has taken no steps to plant a hatchery there and some one else now desires to do so, are we to say to the man who is ready to begin the work of hatching salmon now that he must stand aside and wait, because, forsooth, at some time in the dim, uncertain future the Government might be willing to build a hatchery there? Gentlemen have stated on this floor that if we do not pass this bill there can not be any monopoly in this business.

I guess there is no doubt about that, for if something is not done to encourage the hatchery of salmon in that region very soon, there will not be any product to monopolize. Again I say, Is there anything wrong in permitting the man who puts his money and his energy into the creating or the enlargement of a staple food product—is there anything wrong in permitting him to gather a portion of the results of his own labor and investment?

Mr. MONDELL. Has that policy been pursued anywhere else in the United States up to this time?

Mr. CUSHMAN. I undertake to say that the same or similar conditions do not exist anywhere else in the United States. Now, here is my eloquent young friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who is earnestly declaring that the Government at its own expense should put water on the unfruitful lands of this country in order to make them fruitful (in which I agree with him). But now, when it comes to the proposition of permitting a man to plant a fish hatchery on a barren stream in order to make the stream fruitful, he does not believe in that policy.

Mr. MONDELL. We propose no monopoly. We only propose that the Government dispose of these lands, and that does not make a monopoly.

Mr. CUSHMAN. But you propose that the man who sows on 160 acres in the spring shall reap what that land produces, and to the exclusion of other people, do you not?

Mr. MONDELL. If he pays for it, which these people do not do.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Yes; for the good and sufficient reason that you can not sell a stream with a warranty deed. As I have already said, I have no especial interest in this bill. I regret that this matter might not have been the subject of discussion on this floor earlier in the session, in order that the people of Alaska might have had an opportunity to express themselves upon the subject. My only reason for advocating the passage of this bill is that it seems to me that it would tend to build up and replenish one of their great industries.

No man has a just right to suppose that I would intentionally advocate on this floor legislation that would be to the injury of the people of Alaska, or any of their material interests. By reason of the close commercial union between Alaska and the State of Washington, the interests of Alaska are the interests of the State of Washington. One word more and I will close my few remarks on this matter. This debate has again emphasized the need for a Delegate on this floor representing the people of Alaska.

The Committee on Territories has labored under disadvantages regarding every piece of legislation proposed for Alaska. There is no one on this floor authorized to speak for them. They should have a Delegate here who would be responsible to us on the one hand and responsible to his people at home on the other. Then upon occasions of this kind we would not labor under many of these embarrassments. I have a bill now on the Calendar of this House which has for its object the giving to the people of Alaska a Delegate in Congress, and before this session closes I hope to get it considered and passed. That is all I have to say upon this matter. I believed in the beginning that this was a good bill, and I believe so now.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY].

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that the very purpose he has in view in opposing this bill is the same that gentlemen

have in view who have been favoring it; in other words, to prevent a monopoly there, and also to prevent the waste of one of the most remarkable products with which nature has endowed this country.

We have seen our salmon disappear from the Kennebec, from the Penobscot, and from the Connecticut rivers, or almost utterly disappear from the waters of those streams, and we have the same danger confronting us in Alaska. Instead of the bill giving some special rights to the people who are fishing there, it provides that whoever will put in hatcheries there will have privileges in proportion to the hatcheries they put in and that they shall be permitted to reap as they may sow.

But, it has been said, Why not let the Government go on and appropriate money and put in the hatcheries? Why not compel these people who are fishing the streams to put in the hatcheries? Why not give them the privilege of taking the fish which they put in?

Mr. MONDELL. I suppose the gentleman from Iowa knows that under the present law the cannery are obliged to put in hatcheries, but they have violated the law in that particular, and if they had not violated the law there would be no suggestion of decimation of the fisheries.

Mr. LACEY. Why, because they can take all the fish that come without putting in hatcheries. Here is a proposition that says to the cannery "You may put in hatcheries and you may fish in proportion to the amount of fish you plant." It is a well-known fact, as well established as any fact in regard to salmon, that the fish come back to the same streams in which they are spawned, just as the bird comes back to the same nest or in the same locality where it was hatched. These fish come back to the same streams. They have been marked, experimentally, for several years in order to establish that fact.

If a hatchery is established and a stream is planted with a million fish, there is a reasonable certainty that a portion of them will return. Of course, there must be millions planted in order that thousands may return, because from the time the eggs are spawned they become the prey of everything that swims in the water. The fish eat the eggs and then the little salmon eat the still smaller salmon, and then he in his turn is eaten by a salmon a little larger; and so there must be a tremendous amount of surplus provided for. This bill encourages the location of hatcheries in Alaska and increases the product, and places the burden of it, not upon the Government, but upon the individuals who fish in those streams, and the monopolies referred to have only the right to take in those streams the increased amount of fish above the normal product, provided the hatcheries are established there. It encourages the increase of the fish and delays their extermination.

Mr. MONDELL. This bill provides, among other things, for stocking certain lakes now barren. I want to ask if that is not a departure in legislation—if, in fact, this whole thing is not a departure in legislation—and if the gentleman in his State of Iowa would favor anything of this sort.

Mr. LACEY. The quicker we depart from some of our past ways the better. I have pointed out the Kennebec, the Penobscot, and the Connecticut as examples of what we have allowed to be done in the past, and the gentleman says we are "departing from the sacred precedents of the past." I say the quicker we depart from those precedents which left the streams barren the wiser will be the people of this day and generation. If we do not learn something from the destruction of our natural resources in the past, we are unworthy to benefit by the future.

This is not a proposition for a monopoly; it is a proposition to encourage the planting of additional fish in Alaska, where they are now plentiful, and keep up the splendid supply that has made Alaska the richest fishery in the world. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there ought to be no objection to this bill. I am sure my friend from Illinois would not object to it if he understood it to be merely a question of increasing the supply rather than of creating a monopoly.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Territories, which considered this bill, I state that we gave full and thorough investigation to this subject. We heard a number of persons from Alaska, and the uniform testimony of all of them was that this bill was calculated to increase the output of salmon and increase the propagation of fish rather than to decrease it.

Mr. MONDELL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the committee heard anybody from Alaska except a gentleman who has a hatchery there and the agent of the Interior Department, and who is opposed to this bill, by the way. There is no other evidence in the report.

Mr. GRAHAM. There was also another gentleman, whose name I have forgotten. But I want to say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I was up in Alaska myself last year and visited

this locality. I am not interested in any cannery up there, nor in any company, nor in any hatchery. This gentleman who appeared before us stated that he had spent \$10,000 of his own cash in establishing a hatchery in Alaska.

Mr. MONDELL. Did he have the monopoly of 1,600 miles of coast?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, sir; we do not propose to give any such monopoly in this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. If they organize enough companies you will grant a monopoly of that extent.

Mr. GRAHAM. The bill simply provides that if one of these companies puts in \$20,000, they can take back—how much? Simply the amount above the normal product of that stream to-day; that is, all above what is now taken out of the stream.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman think that it is going to be an easy thing to decide what the "normal product" is?

Mr. GRAHAM. The question is simply this: The man who undertakes this business has to increase the product, because the canneries are to-day, without establishing any hatcheries, taking out all they can catch.

Mr. HULL. Can not the parties engaged in the salmon-catching business go out to sea and take these fish, it may be, miles away from shore? Or do they have to wait till the fish go into the streams or into a hatchery before they catch them?

Mr. GRAHAM. The fish have to come back to the place where they are born to spawn. All the evidence shows that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope I may have one minute more.

Mr. SULZER. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. GRAHAM. The evidence produced before the committee shows that if you propagate a certain kind of young salmon they have a certain peculiarity. The evidence shows that that same stream will produce the same kind of fish. They will come back to the same place in which they were spawned without anything like "tagging." The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] asks how you can "tag" these fish. There is no necessity for "tagging" them. If you plant a certain kind of spawn—say the long-bodied salmon—in a certain stream, then the fish you afterwards catch in that stream are of the same kind—the long-bodied salmon.

Mr. MONDELL. Will not the gentleman qualify his statement by saying that that is the theory, but that both of the gentlemen who were before the committee stated specifically that they did not know as to its truth, that it was simply a theory, that no man had ever demonstrated it, and they did not know what was the fact?

Mr. CUSHMAN. That is exactly similar to that beautiful theory that exists in Wyoming—where my friend comes from—and Montana. The theory is that if a man puts his brand on a calf in the spring that he will get that animal back when it gets to be a cow. From experience of mine in the land of the "maverick" and the "rustler" I am prepared to testify that that is also simply a theory. It is a beautiful theory, but it does not always work out. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. It does in Wyoming; it may not in Montana or Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM. Allow me to state that ex-Governor POWERS, of Maine, who was a member of the subcommittee on this bill, claims to be an expert in regard to salmon fishery in his State, and he favors this measure.

Mr. MONDELL. Was there any suggestion to apply the measure to the Kennebec and the Penobscot?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not in this bill, but if anybody will establish hatcheries there I would favor giving them the benefit of this legislation.

Mr. SULZER. I now ask the gentleman from Illinois to use the balance of his time.

Mr. CANNON. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Two minutes.

Mr. CANNON. And how much has the gentleman from New York?

The SPEAKER. Three minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I yield my two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think that if members of the House will take up section 4 of this bill they will find that it will throw some light on the subject. Under this section if parties deposit hatched salmon in a lake or a barren stream (as they may call it), then whether those fish or some others happen to come back there, the fact that they have been taken there establishes for the benefit of the parties depositing the spawn or young in that stream or lake an absolute monopoly of the salmon found in the waters.

It seems to me that the law which would be proper and wise on this subject would be a law providing that the men who are

taking the salmon from the streams owned and controlled by the United States should be obliged to put young back again in sufficient numbers to replenish the waters from which they have taken the fish. If a bill saying that were proposed, I would cheerfully vote for it; but this bill has for its purpose the giving to some men rights belonging to the people of the United States for nothing.

The result will be the establishment of salmon-fishing monopolies in Alaska; and as soon as these salmon-fishing monopolies are established they will be consolidated, and you will have in this country, so far as salmon are concerned, just exactly what you have to-day in beef—a trust regulating the supply and the price. This is the start, and I hope there is not a Democrat here who will lend his assistance to the passage of a measure of this character. I hope, perhaps vainly, that there are very few Republicans who will.

Mr. SULZER. That is a good argument.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the habits of fish for a good many years, and when anybody makes the statement that any one man is able to tell what the normal yield of a river is this year, and to tell to what extent it has been increased or diminished next year or the year after, I think he is drawing absolutely on his imagination. Then let us not forget the fact that such legislation will produce no end of litigation, by which those who have money and disposition to fight only will be benefited.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] to offer an amendment, which I will accept.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment as an additional section to the bill:

The SPEAKER. That can not be done except by unanimous consent.

Mr. COWHERD. Then I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the motion to suspend the rules be so modified as to include the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That any person, company, or corporation that has established or shall hereafter establish a cannery for canning salmon in the district of Alaska shall also establish and maintain a hatchery and shall return to the streams from which any salmon are taken at least ten times as many salmon each year as are taken from said stream for the use of said cannery; and any person violating this law shall be punished by a fine not to exceed \$100 for each and every day a cannery is operated without maintaining a hatchery and returning salmon to the streams as herein provided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the amendment plainly enough to understand exactly what it is.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I would like to explain it, he reserving the right to object. The proposition is simply to compel anyone establishing a cannery to maintain a hatchery at the same place and to return to the same stream at least ten times as many fish as are taken from it. I understand there is no law that governs that at present. It is simply a regulation of the Department, and that regulation they are not able to enforce. I do not pretend to be posted on this, but that is what I have been told.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall object, because I do not—well, I have no time to state my reasons, but I think I have good reasons for objecting and therefore do so.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, how many minutes have I left?

The SPEAKER. Two minutes.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in the two minutes I have remaining I desire to state to the House that a philosopher has said that the man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before is a benefactor of mankind. This bill is framed on that theory. If it becomes a law, it will surely increase a hundredfold the normal product of salmon. It will do so without taxing the people a cent or taking one dollar from the public Treasury. It will benefit the people of Alaska, the people of the Republic, and the people of all the world. I am surprised at the opposition to this bill.

The subtle tactics of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the covert manipulations of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] are beyond my comprehension. They can only be reconciled on the hypothesis of ignorance. We know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], after he gets through all his big appropriations—many of them as uncalled for as they are unjust—becomes in a spirit of repentance the "watchdog of the Treasury" and objects to every other measure that is brought up in the House.



But, sir, I repeat, this bill does not take a dollar from the Treasury. This bill does not create a monopoly. It does not grant any special privileges. It does not discriminate, it treats all the same, and is for the benefit of the many. I am as much opposed to monopoly as is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], and if this bill created a monopoly, if it gave any man rights that any other man was not entitled to, I would be opposed to it, and I never would have introduced it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] glibly prates about monopoly. If he knows what he is talking about, he is talking for the greatest monopoly in Alaska—the canning trust—and if he does not know that, then he is ignorant of the facts in this case. I suggest that he read the report.

This bill is opposed to monopolies. It will destroy a monopoly. I know something of the canning trust. Whatever opposition this bill has comes from that monopolistic source. I say that the man who toils, who invests his own money, and creates artificially a thousand fish where nature creates only one, that he ought to have, to say the least, the right by law to a part of the increase his industry, his toil, and the sweat of his brow make possible, and that is all that this bill does. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 56, noes 56.

So, two-thirds not having voted for the bill, the motion to suspend the rules and passage was rejected.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request for the return of bills to the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, May 31, 1902.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1920) for the relief of Albert C. Brown.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, May 31, 1902.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 557) for the relief of H. B. Mat-teosian.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, May 31, 1902.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 19) for the relief of George A. Orr.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, these several requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

#### PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I make a privileged report, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up a privileged report, which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 235, have had the same under consideration and respectfully report the same with the recommendation that it be agreed to with the following amendments:

Lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "said motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for."

Line 9, strike out the word "act" and insert the word "measure."

Line 10, strike out the words "the act and amendments shall have been." Add at the end of the resolution, "but this order shall not interfere with revenue or appropriation bills or conference reports."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let us have the resolution reported as amended.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The report is all right.

Mr. DALZELL. If the Clerk will report the resolution as it was introduced into the House, as changed by the interlined words in pencil, he can read the resolution as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately after the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Senate act (S. 3653) and the amendments thereto entitled "An act for the protection of the President of the United States, and for other purposes;" and the consideration of the said measure shall continue privileged until disposed of; but this order shall not interfere with revenue or appropriation bills or conference reports.

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to inquire if this is the resolution as amended?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is the amended resolution, as provided for in the report of the committee.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no objection to its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### VIEWS OF MINORITY ON FUR-SEAL BILL.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] this morning reported back the bill H. R. 13387 from the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] desired me to ask that he have leave of the House to file the views of the minority some time during the present week, and I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL] have leave to file the views of the minority on the bill H. R. 13387.

Mr. PAYNE. During the present week.

The SPEAKER. During the present week. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Let the title of the bill be reported. Several gentlemen have asked for it.

Mr. PAYNE. It is the fur-seal bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 172. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., certain Revolutionary trophies at Allegheny Arsenal, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

H. J. Res. 113. A joint resolution authorizing the use and improvement of Governors Island, Boston Harbor;

H. R. 989. An act to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$1,704.46;

H. R. 13614. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. White;

H. R. 13037. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Anderton;

H. R. 12983. An act granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Emerson;

H. R. 12779. An act granting an increase of pension to George Chamberlin;

H. R. 12428. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Getty;

H. R. 12422. An act granting an increase of pension to David Topper;

H. R. 11288. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Ball;

H. R. 11124. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Scott;

H. R. 9833. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret McCuen;

H. R. 9695. An act granting an increase of pension to Evaline Jenkins;

H. R. 8487. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Crist;

H. R. 8134. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Dunn;

H. R. 7560. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Butler;

H. R. 6718. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew R. Jones;

H. R. 6625. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Downing;

H. R. 6330. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner;

H. R. 6037. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Holcomb;

H. R. 5551. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwards Price Lance, alias Edward Price;

H. R. 5475. An act granting an increase of pension to August Schill, alias August Silville;

H. R. 2857. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances C. Haughton;

H. R. 2623. An act granting an increase of pension to John Smith;

H. R. 2289. An act granting an increase of pension to Pitsar Ingram;

H. R. 2286. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Etna Poole;

H. R. 13395. An act granting a pension to Arthur J. Bushnell;

H. R. 13211. An act granting a pension to Melissa Burton;

H. R. 12418. An act granting a pension to Matilda C. Clarke;

H. R. 10782. An act granting a pension to Ole Steensland;

H. R. 9794. An act granting a pension to Zebulon A. Shipman;

H. R. 9606. An act granting a pension to Charles Blitz;

H. R. 7397. An act granting a pension to Louisa White;

H. R. 5248. An act granting a pension to Frances A. Tillotson;

H. R. 4542. An act granting a pension to Eliza J. West;

H. R. 10144. An act to donate to the State of Alabama the spars of the captured battle ships Don Juan d'Austria and Almirante Oquendo;

H. R. 10995. An act to regulate the introduction of eggs of game birds for propagation;

H. R. 13168. An act to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts;

H. R. 13895. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903;

H. R. 14189. An act to permit the occupancy of the public-printing building by the Grand Army of the Republic; and

H. R. 14589. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7319. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances H. Anthony;

H. R. 13359. An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8752. An act authorizing the board of supervisors of Santa Cruz County, Ariz., to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house and jail for said county;

H. R. 2901. An act to remove the charge of desertion borne opposite the name of Abram Williams; and

H. R. 14018. An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 5505. An act adjusting certain conflicts respecting State school-indemnity selections in lieu of school sections in abandoned military reservations—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4616. An act to grant title to the town of Juneau, Alaska, of lands occupied for school purposes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. R. 107. Joint resolution to provide for the printing of the proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of the Count de Rochambeau—to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 12648. An act establishing a regular term of United States district court in Roanoke City, with Senate amendments—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2764. An act for the relief of the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5213. An act providing for the selection and retirement of medical officers in the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 2276. To fix the time of holding the circuit and district courts for the southern district of West Virginia;

S. 2510. An act extending the time for the commencement and completion of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.; and

S. R. 91. Joint resolution providing for the publication of 50,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina, for five days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BISHOP, for five days, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. BOUTELL, indefinitely, on account of important business. And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of the public civil revenues and expenditures in the Philippine Archipelago—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting copies of communications relating to the Gasparilla Island Military Reservation—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a supplemental report on the transport service at San Francisco—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of the journals and minutes of the first legislative assembly of Porto Rico—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an additional appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect submitting an estimate of appropriation for electrical devices in vaults in certain public buildings—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAWNEY, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13387) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent the extermination of fur-bearing animals in Alaska," and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2303); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11742) granting certain lots in Gnadenhutzen, Ohio, to Gnadenhutzen special school district, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2305); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PRINCE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2497) to correct the military record of John P. Evans, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2306); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6405) removing the charge of desertion from the record of William Harig, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2307); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5079) for the relief of George P. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2308); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 14798) to establish a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 14799) to incorporate the International Bureau of Information—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 14800) amending an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the district of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for said district," approved March 3, 1899, and an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 14801) to make Wilmington, N. C., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14802) for the purchase of real estate, for revenue and customs purposes, at Wilmington, N. C.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 14803) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell or exchange the site for the United States post-office and court-house at Cumberland, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 14804) to prevent the use of houses, rooms, or tenements for immoral purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A resolution (H. Res. 284) directing the Secretary of War to inform the House of the number of promotions made in the Army since April 1, 1898, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.



## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP: A bill (H. R. 14805) granting a pension to Sarah A. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 14806) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clayton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14807) granting an increase of pension to Josephine White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14808) granting an increase of pension to Emile Breaux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14809) granting an increase of pension to Marie A. Daigle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14810) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Broussard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 14811) granting a pension to Mrs. Almedia J. Robinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 14812) for the relief of Matilda Elizabeth West—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAHLE: A bill (H. R. 14813) granting a pension to William Mennecke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 14814) granting a pension to Herman J. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 14815) granting a pension to M. Weiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 14816) granting a pension to U. L. Daniels—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14817) for the relief of Edward W. Sprague, Jasper Sprague, and James B. Hovey—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERN: A bill (H. R. 14818) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. McCord—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14819) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rupert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14820) for the relief of Conrad Zaehring—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 14821) granting an increase of pension to Ananias Cameron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESTER: A bill (H. R. 14822) granting a pension to James H. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTAUER: A bill (H. R. 14823) granting an increase of pension to William Hawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS: A bill (H. R. 14824) granting a pension to Sarah T. Hendrick, widow of Pleasant F. Hendrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14825) to correct the military record of Conrad Bailey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14826) to correct the military record of Thomas Fowler—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14827) granting a pension to William B. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 14828) granting an increase of pension to William H. Mize—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14829) for the relief of the heirs of John Walston—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 14830) for the relief of the estate of Peter H. Knight—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14831) granting an increase of pension to Robert Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14832) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Gilman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 14833) to advance one grade Chief Engineer David Smith, United States Navy, retired—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 14834) granting an increase of pension to James P. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWIE: A bill (H. R. 14835) for the relief of George O. Baker—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 14836) granting a pension to Rebecca L. Chambers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14837) granting a pension to John H. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of American shipmasters,

urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions of Williamsburg and Bluffs, Colo., favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Resolutions of the joint convention of Bankers' Associations of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma and Indian Territories, opposing the branch banking bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Warren, R. I., for the passage of a bill to forbid Government liquor selling in Soldiers' Homes and immigrant stations—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Almedia J. Robinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of North American Gymnastic Union of Pittsburg, Pa., in regard to House bill 12199—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of Electrical Workers' Association No. 3, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Fully Disabled Veterans' Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing Senate bill 4850, with the exception of the amendment to section 2, as adopted by the House Committee on Invalid Pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petitions of citizens of Chesterfield, Elizabethtown, Essex, and other towns in the State of New York, for the passage of House bill 7674, providing for the purchase of Fort Ticonderoga, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolutions of Branch 84, Boston Postal District National Association of Letter Carriers, on the death of the late Hon. Amos J. Cummings—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of the Ladies' East Side Anti-Trust Association of the sixteenth assembly district of New York City, for the repeal of the tariff on meats—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Purcell Commercial Club, Purcell, Ind. T., opposing the passage of the Flynn bill or the Moon bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., and numerous citizens of Washington, Kansas, and Michigan, favoring the passage of House bill 6565, known as the Grosvenor pure-fiber bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Resolutions of McKinley Club of Elizabeth, N. J., and Edward G. Brown Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hoboken, N. J., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 1197, Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of North American Gymnastic Union of Des Moines, Iowa, in relation to House bill 12199—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. IRWIN: Papers to accompany House bill 5039, granting a pension to Marium Barton—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON of Kansas: Resolution of the Bankers' Association of Kansas, Indian Territory, and Oklahoma Territory, in opposition to the so-called branch banking bill—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 735, Pittsburg, Kans., and No. 647, of Mineral, Kans., favoring the restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from the south and east of Europe—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KERN: Petition of Thomas Knoebel, of East St. Louis, Ill., in support of House bill 123, for the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolutions of Zealous Lodge, No. 217, Locomotive Firemen, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of pharmacists of St. Clair County, Ill., for amendments to House bill 7189, to increase the efficiency of the Marine-Hospital Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Bricklayers and Masons' International Union No. 2, of Belleville, Ill., in relation to the employment of union bricklayers and masons in the erection of the naval dry dock at New Orleans, La.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of C. S. Thomas, of East St. Louis, Ill., favoring Senate bill 2172, for the payment of certain medical expenses of

sick officers and enlisted men—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of St. Clair Lodge, No. 353, Machinists' Union, of Belleville, Ill., favoring appropriation for naval deficiency—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Mexican war veterans, favoring pension for all survivors of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Retail Merchants' Association of Belleville, Ill., favoring House bill 9352—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Chicago Federation of Labor, favoring appropriation for hydrographic survey and the amended immigration bill—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Master Plumbers' Associations of East St. Louis, Ill., and Belleville, Ill., favoring contracts for Government buildings to be let directly to plumbers and not to a general contractor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of Electrical Workers' Brotherhood No. 3, of New York City, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to William Hawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Bangor, Me., and Board of Trade of Thomaston, Me., urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts protesting against the taking of the lands of the Sioux Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the board of aldermen and common council of Medford, and aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of Provincetown Maritime Exchange, in favor of a law to pension men of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of the common council of Medford, Mass., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Provincetown Maritime Exchange, in favor of a law to pension men of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petition of Sylvester St. John, John Hoge, and others of Kearney, Nebr., in favor of House bill 7475, for additional homesteads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NORTON: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Moss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill 8663, for the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Woodford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Paper to accompany House bill 4082, granting a pension to Jacob Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 14162, granting a pension to Charity A. Seibell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Petition of John H. Martin and Henry B. Lindsay, heirs at law of John Walston, of Florence, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to James P. Freeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Electrical Workers No. 3, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky: Petition of Simon Kenton Lodge, No. 345, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Covington, Ky., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Electrical Workers No. 3, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolutions of Provincetown Maritime Exchange, urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of Wallar Post, No. 223, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, favoring House bill 13986, to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 3, 1902.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 22d ultimo, certain information relative to quarters rented by the State Department, giving the location, area of floor space occupied, and annual rental thereof; which, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of Puget Sound Harbor, No. 16, American Association of Masters and Pilots, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men in the Life-Saving Service, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Okanogan Protective Stock Association, of Conconully, Wash., remonstrating against the leasing of the public domain in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ELKINS presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Parkersburg, W. Va., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Bluestone Lodge, No. 446, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Bluefield; of Local Division No. 511, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Kenova; of Local Division No. 408, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Kanawha, and of Local Division No. 140, Order of Railway Conductors, of New River, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the passage of the so-called Grosvenor anti-injunction bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen No. 544, of Point Pleasant; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1227, of Montgomery; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1882, of Cedar Grove; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1729, of Central; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1788, of Maybeury; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1808, of Switchback; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1888, of Caperton; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1905, of Mount Hope; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1907, of Coaldale; of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1910, of Elverton, and of United Mine Workers of America, Union No. 1945, all in the State of West Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14046) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and to submit a report thereon. I wish to give notice that I shall call the bill up for consideration at as early a day as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom the subject was referred, submitted a report accompanied by a joint resolution (S. R. 110) empowering the State of Minnesota to file selections of indemnity school lands upon public lands in Minnesota, otherwise undisposed of, after the survey thereof in the field, and prior to the approval and filing of the plat of survey thereof; which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 106) empowering the State of Minnesota to file its selections for indemnity school lands upon public lands in Minnesota, otherwise undisposed of in townships, immediately upon the survey thereof in the field and prior to the approval and filing of the plat and survey thereof, reported adversely thereon; and the joint resolution was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5146) granting an increase of pension to Florian V. Sims; and